

THE
SOTERIOLOGY
OF SAINT CYRIL OF
ALEXANDRIA
by
Constantine Dratsellas

A Thesis
submitted to the Faculty of Divinity,
University of Edinburgh, for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Edinburgh

1967



ABSTRACT OF THESIS

Name of Candidate Constantine N. DRATSELLAS.

Address

Degree Doctor of philosophy Date

Title of Thesis The Soteriology of Cyril of Alexandria.

In this Thesis I am trying to present a systematic exposition of the Soteriology of Cyril of Alexandria, and to compare it to the Soteriological Doctrine of the Greek Fathers.

A In the Introductory chapter I am presenting a brief history of the Soteriology of the Greek Fathers in order to evaluate both Cyril's doctrine of Salvation and his place in the whole Patristic Soteriology. My general conclusions are the following: a) the Fathers dealing with the Theanthropic Person of the Incarnate Logos speak also at the same time of His Saving Work. b) By Incarnation the Fathers mean not only the fact of Christ's assuming Human Flesh but the Whole Mystery of His Economy. c) The Fathers never formulated any Soteriological Theories. They saw the Mystery of Jesus Christ as a Whole. Therefore we can have a correct Patristic Soteriology only in combining all their ideas on Salvation.

B The Soteriology of Cyril.

I General Remarks: a) Cyril's Theology is on the one hand biblical and Patristic, both essentially and methodically, and on the other hand strictly Christological. b) He has not written any systematical soteriological Treatise. Nevertheless in all his works and particularly in his Christological ones we can find his important Soteriological ideas and teaching. In Cyril's Theology Christology and Soteriology are inseparable. The Incarnate Logos is at the same time the unique Saviour of men. c) Cyril's Soteriological importance lies mainly in his excellent Synthesis of all conceptions of Salvation. Cyril approaches the mystery of man's Salvation, and of Christ's saving Work as a Whole.

II The Whole Thesis is divided into two parts:

In the first Part I deal with Salvation as Man's Need. a) Anthropology and Hamartiology are two necessary presuppositions of Soteriology. Without Man as a real creature, and particularly as a sinful and corrupted being, we cannot speak of his Salvation. b) Adam was created relatively Sinless. c) The possibility of sin was not ruled out for him. d) The Image of God existed in Man's Soul. e) The Character of Adam's sin is found in the Combination of five Greek words 'Αμαρτία,

Παραχολή, Παράβασις, Παράπτωμα, Ἀνομία.

f) The Essence of Adam's sin consisted in that it created a sinful state, a state of corruption and guilt for Adam and the whole of mankind.

g) Through Sin Adam's Divine Image was wounded seriously and became dim and obscured but it was not completely lost. The human being did not become inhuman. Man needed Salvation which only God could offer.

Jesus Christ came as the unique Saviour.

The Second Part is called "Salvation through Christ". I divide this Part into two divisions. In the first, I deal with the Theanthropic Person and the Saving Work of Jesus Christ and, in the second I deal with the personal Application of Christ's Offer.

I a) Man's Salvation was realized within human history at a special time but God's Plan for this Salvation was eternal, b) Only the Son was Incarnate. This happened according to the Will of the Whole Holy Trinity. c) The Salvation of man was an act of God's free Love and loving freedom.

c) Cyril speaks of Jesus Christ as the eternal Logos and as the historical.

historical Jesus. d) After the Incarnation of the Logos the Mystery of the Holy Trinity was not destroyed. e) Cyril even in his earlier writings speaks of two perfect-complete Natures in the One Person of Jesus Christ. His Human Nature consisted of Human Body and Human Soul. Some difficulties depend on Cyril's earlier theological terminology.

- II I examine Man's Salvation with regard to God and then I speak of the manifestation of His Properties in it, b) with regard to God and Man and then I speak of Cyril's understanding of Reconciliation, and c) with regard to Man himself and then I deal with Cyril's teaching of Redemption. I present Cyril's four conceptions of Salvation. I am sure that Cyril's doctrine of Salvation is the fullest and the correct christian Soteriology. In this division I examine many Soteriological questions.
- II In the second Division a) I examine the question of Man's Justification, its preparation, its essence and its presuppositions. b) I examine the problem of Faith in the application of Salvation. c) No doubt the question of Divine Grace has an important place in this division. d) The doctrine of the Church as the Ark of Christ's Grace and Man's Salvation is of the greatest significance in Cyril's Soteriology and e) I approach the question of the eternal state of Christians, the question of relationship between Salvation and the world of Eternity.

THE
SOTERIOLOGY
OF
SAINT CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA

by

CONSTANTINE DRATSELLAS

A Thesis
submitted to the Faculty of Divinity,
University of Edinburgh, in partial
Fulfilment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Edinburgh

1967

PREFACE

The teaching of Salvation is of the greatest significance in the Theology of St. Cyril of Alexandria. Cyril was a great Theologian. He was the most distinguished Saint of Byzantine Orthodoxy¹ and exercised such an important influence on the Ecclesiastical Doctrine which, except Athanasius, was not exercised by any of the other Greek Fathers. And, as it has been said, if we except Augustine there is none among all the other fathers whose works have been adopted so extensively by ecumenical Councils as a standard expression of Christian Faith.² Cyril's main interest was Christology and his Theology was strictly christological. He wanted everything to be done with reference to the Theanthropic Person of the Incarnate Logos. This synthetic approach to Jesus Christ both as the Eternal Logos and as the Historical Jesus is the basis of Cyril's theology. Cyril however always speaks of the Incarnate Logos in terms not only of His Nature but also of His saving work. Cyril never separates the Being of God from His Acting. Thus Jesus Christ is the Unique Saviour of Mankind. Therefore Christology and Soteriology are inseparable in Cyril's Theology. For Cyril there is non abstract doctrine about the Incarnate Logos. Since Christianity is the only true and perfect Religion, there should be a real christian doctrine of Salvation, a Soteriology. And if Jesus Christ is the Soul of Christian Religion, Salvation is to be considered as its very essence. The "New Creation in Christ" is a wonderful reality. So the doctrine of salvation is so important on the one hand because of its connection with Jesus Christ and on the other hand because of

-
1. Campenhausen, H.V. Griechische Kirchenväter. Stuttgart 1955, E.T. by S. Godman. N.York 1959. p.145.
 2. Bardenhewer O. Patrologie³ Freiburg. 1910. p.36. Cyril was called "Guardian of Accuracy" (Eulogius Alex. in Photius Bibl. Cod. 230), "Seal of the Fathers" (Anastasius Sinan) and Doctor Ecclesiae.

what it contains and means for Mankind. This is more appreciated if we know the consequences of sin for men. Men need salvation. This has been the greatest and deepest nostalgia of mankind. The doctrine of Salvation has been terribly misunderstood and misinterpreted. That is why working on Cyril and particularly on his Soteriology I wanted not only to present this dissertation as a Thesis for a Degree, but also to find out whether Cyril's teaching was really biblical and whether a real and perfect Christian doctrine should be Biblical and Patristic as well. That is why I have tried to expound Cyril's teaching as I myself have understood it through his writings. This work is based on Cyril's books so much that I often let him express his ideas in his own words.

Like almost all the Greek Fathers Cyril has not written any systematic treatise on Soteriology; there was not any controversy about this question at his time. He had to defend the christological doctrine. Moreover the conviction about salvation through Christ was for him, as for all Fathers, so familiar; it was the atmosphere in which he lived.¹

I divide this Thesis into two Parts. In the first I deal with man's Need for Salvation. Thus the greatness of Christ's offer can be evaluated. The second part presents the Salvation through our Saviour Jesus Christ. Before I close this preface I should like to express my deepest gratitude to all those who have helped me in this work: The World Council of Churches, The British Council of Churches, and the Apollonian Scholarships Committee in Athens under H.E. the British Ambassador in Greece Sir^{R.} Murray, for their Scholarships which enabled

1. Döerholt B. Die Lehre von der Genugthung Christ; Paderborn 1891. p.25.

me to come to Edinburgh and to work on this thesis: To New College, Edinburgh, the Principal, and all the Professors, for their kindness and love: the Episcopal Theological College, Edinburgh, where I stayed for two years during my studies at New College; The Principal, the Staff and the students for their great hospitality, and corrections of English terms in my work. To my Professor John Karmiris in Athens for his important instructions and encouragement: the Rev. Professor G. Florovsky who first focussed my attention upon Cyril of Alexandria: Principal J.N.D. Kelly of Oxford for his useful theological help: the Staff of New College Library, of the National Library of Scotland, and Dr. William's Library in London: Mr. John Sawyer, Mr. W. Griesbrook and Rev. Vernon Robertson for their great help in improving my English, particularly to Father John Moir for his extremely great help in many ways during my stay in Scotland.

I cannot close this preface without expressing my most cordial thanks and deepest gratitude to my supervisor Professor John McIntyre for his encouragement, most important instructions and most useful corrections in my work.

I have, purposely, left to the last, the mentioning of my supervisor Professor Thomas F. Torrance, because I should like to say that without his ceaseless guidance, invaluable help and most useful instructions I could never have finished this work which even now is far from being perfect. I am particularly grateful to Professor T.F. Torrance for whatever he has done for me. I consider myself most fortunate to have had the great benefit of my supervisor's insight and erudition, even in cases where we may disagree on some points.

Constantine Dratsellas.

Edinburgh.

C O N T E N T S

Preface I

Contents IV

An Introductory Chapter

A brief History of the Soteriological Doctrine of the Greek Fathers

page.

1

I Apostolic Fathers	p.3	IV Alexandrian Theologians	13
II The Greek Apologists	7	V Antirigenist Theologians	19
III Antiheretical Writers	9	VI Antiochene Theologians	20
VII The Cappadocian Fathers	p.24		

THE SOTERIOLOGY
OF CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA

PART ONEMAN'S NEED FOR SALVATIONFirst SectionAdam and his Original state

Chapter One: The Cause and Goal of Man's Creation	31
Chapter Two: The Image of God in Adam	41
Chapter Three: The Original State of Adam	49

Second SectionAdam and his sin

Chapter One: The Possibility of Sin in Adam	65
Chapter Two: The Character of Adam's Sin	74
Chapter Three: The Essence of Adam's sin	83
Chapter Four: Necessity of Salvation	100

PART TWO

SALVATION THROUGH CHRIST

DIVISION I. JESUS CHRIST AND HIS SAVING WORK

First Section

God and Man's Salvation

	page.
Chapter One: Man's Salvation and the Eternal Plan of God	104
Chapter Two: The Holy Trinity and the Incarnation of the Son	115
Chapter Three: The Necessity of the Incarnation	117

Second Section

The Incarnate Logos - Cyril's Christology

Chapter One:	The Theanthropic Person of the Incarnate Logos	122
Chapter Two:	The Incarnate Logos and the Impassibility of Deity	135
Chapter Three:	Communicatio Idiomatum - its Consequences	140
Chapter Four:	(i) The Conception of "Enhypostasis".	148
	(ii) The Incarnate Logos in His Relation to the Holy Trinity	149
	(iii) The Hypostatic Union and Man's Salvation	150
Chapter Five:	The Virgin-Mary truly Theotokos	152
Chapter Six:	Cyril's Christology in its relation to:	
	I. Apollinarianism II. Nestorianism and III. Monophysitism	155

Third Section

Jesus Christ our Mediator and Saviour

Chapter One: Christ's Mediatorship	158
Chapter Two: Christ as the Second Adam	165
Chapter Three: The Three Offices of Jesus Christ	174
Chapter Four: Salvation through the whole saving Work of Christ	179

Fourth Section

The Nature of Salvation

	page.
Chapter One: Salvation with regard to God: Manifestation of His Properties	186
Chapter Two: Salvation with regard to God and Man: Reconciliation	189
Chapter Three: Salvation with regard to Man: Redemption -	193
A'. Synthesis of Four Conceptions of Salvation	193
B'. Man as the Creation in Christ	206

DIVISION II. THE PERSONAL APPLICATION OF SALVATION

First Section

The Divine Grace and Man's Justification.

Chapter One: Divine Grace and Man's Salvation	213
Chapter Two: Universality of Christ's Saving Work	219
Chapter Three: Man's Justification	
I. Preparation of Justification	223
II. Essence of Justification	224
III. Presuppositions of Justification	232
Chapter Four: Sanctification of Man.	235

Second Section

The Ark of Salvation - The Church	247
-----------------------------------	-----

Third Section

The Completion of Salvation - Eschalology	260
---	-----

Appendices

I. Bishops and Patriarchs of Alexandria	268
II. Chronological Table of Cyril's Works	270
III. Important dates of Cyril's Life	272

Bibliography

I. Sources: The Works of Cyril. Editions, Collections, Translations.	275
II. Select bibliography.	280

An Introductory Chapter

A Brief History of the Soteriological Doctrine of the Greek Fathers

A brief History of the Soteriological
Doctrine of the Greek Fathers.

In order to evaluate Cyril's great contribution to the development of the Soteriological doctrine we must examine it in relation to the whole patristic teaching of Salvation. In this introductory Chapter I am trying to present a very brief history of the Soteriological teaching of the Greek Fathers. I am presenting here only the most representative Greek writers and Fathers of different ancient Schools of Theology and Thoughts, namely: I the Apostolic Fathers, II the Greek Apologists, III the Antiheretical writers, IV the Alexandrian Theologians, V the Anti-origenists theologians, VI the Antiochene Fathers and VII the Cappadocian Fathers.

My conclusions as far as the Soteriology of the Fathers is concerned, are the following: (i) The Fathers dealing with the Theanthropic Person of the Incarnate Logos speak also at the same time of His saving work. They never separate Jesus Christ from His redemptive work. And as Emil Brunner says "Das Werk und Person des Erlösers sind eine unauflösliche Einheit"⁽¹⁾ They always combine the Being and the Acting of God in the Person and the work of the Redeemer. This is very important for a correct understanding of Patristic Theology and for evaluating the Patristic thought (ii) When the Fathers speak of the Incarnation of the Logos they mean not only the Birth of Christ and His assuming human flesh but the whole Mystery of His Economy, and therefore, His Birth, His Life on earth, His Work, His Sufferings, His Death, His Resurrection.

⁽¹⁾ Brunner E. Der Mittler. Zürich 1947, p.359.

It is worth noticing that the Fathers always lays much stress on Christ's Resurrection which is the centre of christian faith and the affirmation of His Birth, His Life and His Death etc. And when they speak of His Death, they see it in the light of His Incarnation. They see the mystery of Christ as a Whole. They never separate these two aspects of this mystery. They speak of the Whole Incarnate Logos and of His Saving Work, and they ascribe the Salvation of man to the whole Christ, to His Whole Saving Work and not to any particular act of His life. The two previous conclusions lead us to a third one, so (iii) the Fathers never formulated any special Theories on Soteriology. These are inventions of modern theologians who form several theories and then try to find some of the Fathers as supporters of their personal ideas. This, leads to a dangerous misunderstanding of Patristic theology.

Since the Fathers saw the mystery of Jesus Christ as a whole, it is in this same way that we must approach and examine their teaching. They have not written any systematic treatise on Soteriology¹ except St. Athanasius and Gregory of Nyssa who in their respective works, "De Incarnatione Verbi" and "Oratio Catechetica Magna", deal with the soteriological question in detail. The Fathers did not find it necessary to construct a Theology of the Atonement because there were no rival theologies in this field.² Therefore it is only in collecting all the Soteriological ideas of the Fathers, scattered in their works, that we can have a patristic understanding of this crucial subject of

-
1. L. Grenstend. The Atonement in History and in life. - London 1936 p.177.
 2. H. Rashdall. The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology. London 1925. p.234.

Salvation. In addition to this, it is only in combining together all the ideas of the Fathers, that this Patristic Soteriology can be correct and a real expression of Patristic thought, which relates man's salvation neither to Christ's Incarnation only nor to his Death only but, as I have said, to the whole Mystery of His Economy.

In expounding the thoughts of the Fathers I am following one of the basic rules of interpretation. Each idea of each Father can be and should be examined and understood in the light of his whole theology, and each passage-text should be examined only in connection with his whole work or works. I am not going to expound the teaching of all the Fathers nor even the doctrine of each of them in detail.

I' Apostolic Fathers

Dealing with the history of the Soteriological doctrine in early centuries we have to start with the Apostolic Fathers "who form a link between the New Testament foundation and the formulated doctrine of later times".¹ In the Apostolic Fathers we find little Theology, but in their teaching we find a faithful expression of the New Testament Theology. And though Salvation through Christ was their absolute conviction, they did not examine the question of the Nature of salvation systematically.

(1) Clement of Rome directly refers to Christ's Blood in relation to man's salvation - "Let us look steadfastly to the Blood of Christ and Know how precious it is to His Father, for being shed for our Salvation it brought the grace of repentance to all the world".² He

1. J. Mozley. The Doctrine of the Atonement. London 1915. p.94.

2. I Ep. ad. Cor. XII, 7, VII, 4.

also speaks of Redemption through the "Blood of the Lord"¹ as well as of the Love, and Will² of God³ as affecting the redemption of the fallen man. Christ offered Himself for us⁴ and God justifies men who believe to Him.⁵ By speaking of Christ's Blood as having been shed for our Salvation, Clement refers to Christ's death. The universality of Redemption and the death of Christ as the source of grace are closely expressed by Clement. (H.N. Oxenham. The Catholic Doctrine of the Atonement. London 1869. p.101.) However, when Clement says that Christ "came and called us who were being lost"⁶ he refers to His Incarnation and His work and life on earth among men. He finds Christ's Incarnation as a necessary presupposition for His Death. Clement's teaching of God "uniting us to Himself through Love (Ad. Corinth. XII.6.) and of Christ's blood being given "on our behalf" (Ad. Cor. 21, 6) can be understood only in the light of Christ's Incarnation which enabled Him to be our Representative on His Cross. Apart from His Incarnation His Death would be impossible. Thus we have here the full conception of Christ's whole saving work.

(2) Ignatius (I.107, 110) refers to Christ's Cross which is "our Salvation and our eternal life"⁷ and to His Passion which is the "cause of our life".⁸ He lays stress on the Death of Christ who "died for our sake to save the believers from death".⁹ He calls the Blood of Christ Love of God in order to express his conviction that the Love and

1. I Ep. ad Cor. XII, 7. VII, 7.

2. I. Cor. XII, 5-6.

3. I. Cor. XXXII, 4.

4. I. Cor. XII, 6.

5. I. Cor. XXXII, 4 - XII, 7.

6. 2 Cor. II, 7.

7. Ad. Ephes. 18, 1.

8. Magn. 5.

9. Tral. 2, 2.

the Will of God were the cause of Man's Salvation through Jesus Christ. This idea of Christ's Blood is connected with the general idea of Christ's saving work. That is why Ignatius says that even the angels must believe in Christ's saving Blood".¹ But Ignatius connects Christ's Death with His glorious Resurrection when he speaks of man's Salvation.² Ignatius goes on to speak of man's Salvation without any reference to Christ's death.³ This means that he refers to the whole conception of Christ's Incarnation which includes the idea of His Death. In other cases Ignatius connects the Birth with the Death of Christ⁴ in order to express the same idea, i.e. the whole conception of Christ's saving work. It is in this general sense that the Incarnation brought the destruction of the power of evil spirits⁵. However, Ignatius reminds us that Christ "being immortal and invisible, became visible for our sake, and being incorruptible and exempt from pain, became subject to pain for our sake". (Ad. Polycarp III, 2.) Here Ignatius apparently refers to Christ's Incarnation which he connects with His death and Passion for man's sake.

(3) Barnabas (c.100-131) language is clearer. He sees in Christ's death the fulfilment of O. Testament prophecies.⁶ Jesus Christ offered His own Blood for the remission of our sins⁷ and for the giving of life to men. "The Son of God who is Lord and is to judge the quick and the dead has suffered, so that His wounds might give us life."⁸ Here we have both aspects of Salvation, forgiveness of sins and a New life through Christ. His Body was a sacrifice both for our sins⁹ and for the

1. Smyrn. 6, 1.

2. Trol. 9, 10 - Magn. 9, 1-2.

3. Phil. 5, 2.

4. Ephes. 19, 1.

5. Ephes. 19.

6. 8, 1-3.

7. 5, 1.

8. 9,

9. Ibid.

destruction of death.¹ However in the fifth chapter of his epistle, Barnabas connects Christ's Death, His Resurrection and His Whole Incarnation." if He had not come in the flesh, neither would men have looked upon Him and been saved. Therefore the Son of God came in the flesh to this end, that He might sum up the complete late of their sins. But He Himself endured that He might destroy death and show forth the resurrection of the dead for that He must needs be manifested in the flesh; that at the same time He might redeem the promise made to the Fathers and by preparing the new people for Himself might show, while He was on earth, that having brought about the resurrection, He will Himself exercise judgement.² Barnabas cannot understand the Incarnation and the Death of Christ apart from each other. Again he goes on to say that "Christ was manifested..... that we might receive the covenant through Him who inherited it, [The Lord Jesus was prepared beforehand for this purpose, that He might appear and redeem out of the darkness our hearts which had already been paid over unto death and delivered up to the lawlessness of error and so might establish the covenant in us through the Word."³ The purpose of His death is man's Salvation, and this is identical with the goal of His manifestation among the people on earth. Thus Barnabas says: "If He ('Christ') had not come in the flesh how could we have been saved to see Him?" (Epist. V, 10) Christ's Incarnation and His Death in the work of Salvation are inseparable and constitute a whole.

(4) For Polycarp (f.156) also Jesus Christ "endured even death for our sins" but God raised Him up having loosed the pains of Hades".⁴

-
1. 5, 6-7.
 2. 5, 6-13.
 3. 14, 5-7.
 4. Ad. Phil. 1,2.

Here through the death of Christ, Satan and death lost their power, authority and dominion and thus man obtained forgiveness of sins. Christ "bore our sins in His own Body upon the tree (the Cross) for us.... in order that we might live in Him, He endured all things".¹ But it was the same Jesus Christ who was raised up for us.² Here Polycarp lays stress on Christ's Resurrection in relation to our Salvation. Resurrection and death are brought together in the work of man's Salvation. In his brief letter to Phillipian, St. Polycarp invites them to imitate the unique example of patience, Christ. Therefore, Polycarp refers to the whole saving work of Jesus Christ, His life as an example, His Sufferings, His Resurrection, when he speaks of Salvation.

(5) Hermas (c.150) refers to the remission of our sins through Jesus Christ "by labouring much and enduring much toil or labour and having Himself then cleansed the sins of the people, He showed them paths of life, giving to them the law which He received from His Father."³ Hermas refers to the whole earthly saving work of Christ. And when he says that "by nobody else you can be saved but by the great and glorious name",⁴ he apparently speaks of Jesus Christ Himself through the whole Incarnation which includes His death by which man is forgiven and saved.

II "The Greek Apologists"

The aim of the Christian Apologists was to defend Christian Religion against its pagan enemies. That is why their systematic exposition of

-
1. Phil. 8, 1-2.
 2. Phil. 9, 2.
 3. Sim. S. VI, 2, 3.
 4. Vis. 4, 11, 4.

Christian Dogmatics lacked very much, as Riviere says (c.o.p. p.134) As in the Apostolic Fathers so in the early Apologists we find little Theology concerning our soteriological question, although they too were absolutely certain that salvation could be realized only through Christ.

(1) Justin (†. 163-167) the philosopher and martyr is an exception to this rule. He speaks of Christ's saving passion and mystery in real connection with man's salvation¹ and the cleansing of those who believe.² (Harnack Ad. Dogmengeschichte I. p.500). It is through the Cross of Christ and our Baptism that we are redeemed from sin.³ Christ is our Redeemer⁵ and thus it is through Him that we receive remission of sins. His Blood is really saving Blood.⁵ This whole saving work and Passion of Christ took place according to the Will of the Father⁶, who willed that His Son should take upon Himself the curse of all⁷. Thus He is an offering for all who willed to be saved.⁸ However for Justin the victory of Christ over the devil, is clearly related to Christ's birth⁹ or to His Birth, Death and Resurrection together.¹⁰ Justin often connects Christ's assuming Flesh and His Death. "The Logos of God became man for our sakes, that becoming a partaker of our sufferings He might also bring us healing" (II Apol. 13). "He took flesh and blood in view of our salvation". (Ibid. I. 66). "Having become man for the human race He endured all the sufferings....." (Ibid. 63). Here again we have the same general conception of Christ's saving work

1. Dial. c. Tryph. 1, 32.

2. Apolog. 1, 32.

3. Dial. 1, 86.

4. Dial. 30, 76, 85.

5. Dial. 24.

6. Dial. 95.

7. Ibid.

8. Ibid. 40.

9. Ibid. 78.

10. Ibid. 85.

through His Incarnation, Life, Death and Resurrection, which are inseparable, and which together as a whole are the cause of our Salvation.

(2) In the Epistle to Diognetus¹ we read that "God in pity for us took upon Himself our sins and Himself parted with His own Son as a ransom for us".² This happened "when our iniquity had become complete, and it had become perfectly manifest that punishment and death were expected".³ In this epistle we also read of the relation between the Incarnation and Salvation. It was impossible for us to be justified except in the Son of God whose righteousness justified many wicked.⁴ However the author of this Epistle reminds us that "it was in gentleness and meekness that He sent Him, as a King might send a Son who was also King; He sent Him as God. He sent Him as a man to men; He sent Him saving, as using persuasion not force; for force is not of God; He sent Him as calling".⁵ Therefore Christ is presented in His work among men, calling, loving, persuading them. This leads us again to the whole understanding of Christ's saving work through His Incarnation, which in the general sense includes His Birth, Life, Death, Resurrection etc.

III. Antiheretical Literature of the 2nd Century ('A' Period)

(1) Irenaeus' (c.174-189) contribution to the history of the Soteriological doctrine was undoubtedly great. He tried to examine

-
1. I account this epistle among the Apologists because of its content, and character.
 2. 9, 2-6.
 3. Ibid.
 4. Ibid.
 5. Ibid.

the relation of our fall and corruption through Adam to our restoration, through our solidarity with Christ. The central idea and the Key-conception which Irenaeus uses to explain this teaching is his understanding of Recapitulation.¹ This is a term with two ideas, the "summing up" and generally the "restoration". Christ sums up in Himself all Humanity in order to restore it and to bring it to its origin. "He summed up in Himself the long roll of the human race bringing to us a compendious salvation that what we had lost in Adam, namely being in the Image and likeness of God, we might regain in Jesus Christ."² As man was unable to come out of this state (death after Adam), God in His goodness gave him the Saviour (Adv. Haer. III, 20, 1) in whom we find that which we lost in Adam, i.e. the image and likeness of God. (Ibid. III, 18, 1.) Thus as Adam was the originator of a race disobedient and doomed to death, so Christ can be regarded as inaugurating a new redeemed humanity.³ That is why Christ is called Second Adam⁴ and as such "He recapitulated in Himself all the dispersed peoples dating back to Adam all tongues and the whole race of mankind along with Adam himself."⁵ It is for this reason that Christ restores fellowship with God to all,⁶ perfects man according to God's Image and likeness.⁷ The Incarnation is the presupposition of the Redemption. Christ became what we are, to make us what He is (Ibid. v. prsef.)

Through Christ's obedience man has regained what he had lost through

-
1. J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, London, 1958. p.172.
 2. Ad. Haecreses, III, 18, 1.
 3. Ibid. III. 22, 4.
 4. Ibid. III. 21, 10.
 5. Ibid. III. 22, 3.
 6. Ibid. III. 18, 7.
 7. Ibid. V. 21, 2.

Adam's disobedience.¹ Irenaeus speaks of an inner relation between man's creation and his Re-creation, namely his Salvation through the Incarnate Logos.² But speaking of Christ's Incarnation Irenaeus does not forget Christ's death by which He "reconciled us to God,"³ and propitiated for us the Father against whom man had sinned.⁴ He redeemed us⁵ by His Blood.⁵ Irenaeus speaks of Christ's death as a sacrifice in which God offers His own dear Son for our redemption. (Ibid. IV, 5, 4.) "By His Passion He destroyed death, chased away error, corruption and ignorance, manifested both life and truth and gave incorruptibility. (Ibid. II 20, 3.) He reconciles us to Him by His fleshy body and redeems us by His Blood. (Ibid. V. 14, 3.) He, who delivered man from sin should have been both God and man. "For if man's conqueror had not been man, the enemy would not have been conquered justly, and again if it had not been God who granted the Salvation, we could not have securely held this salvation".⁶

Jesus Christ "gave His own life on behalf of our lives and His Flesh instead of our flesh".⁷ Here we find both the idea of Christ's death as a Substitution and the teaching of a "ransom".⁸ But the dominion of the devil over men was unjust and therefore he had to be justly punished.⁹ The Atonement was an act of justice with regard with the devil and an act of God's Mercy with regard to us. Irenaeus speaks of the Victory of Christ over the devil which he did not

1. Ad. Haer. V. 16, 3.

2. Bethune-Baker. Introduction to the early History of Christian doctrine. London. 1903. p.334 note 2.

3. Ad. Haer. III. 16, 9.

4. Ibid. V. 17, 1.

5. III, 16, 9 - III, 16, 9.

6. Ad. Haer. III. 19, 6.

7. Ibid. V, 1, 2.

8. Irenaeus does not say to whom the ransom was paid. Elsewhere he says: men were debtors only to God as they had transgressed His Commandments (Ibid. V, 16, 3, V, 17, 1.).

9. Adv. Haer. V. 2, 1.

expect. "The all-powerful Word of God, not lacking in righteousness justly turned against the rebellion itself, delivering His own from it".¹ Aulen calls attention to the fact that the victory of Christ over the power of devil involves every part of His life - His human Incarnation as living, dying and rising again.² For Irenaeus, the work of Christ consists of the fulfilment of man's original destiny and final goal, the redemption of man from corruption and death, his deliverance from the power of devil³ and his reunion with God. The Incarnation of Christ was necessary for man's Salvation. This Incarnation however, means the whole work of Christ through His coming into this world, His life, His Death, and his powerful Resurrection. The Death of Christ is a part of His incarnate Life. The synthesis of all these ideas of Irenaeus is stated in his book mentioned above. "The Lord redeemed us by His Blood and gave His Life for our lives and His Flesh instead of our flesh, pouring out the Spirit of the Father to secure union of God and man, bringing God down to man by the Spirit and raising man to God through His Incarnation and securing and truly giving us incorruption through His advent through Communion with God."⁴ Thus Irenaeus embraces Salvation as a whole, as a result of the whole saving work of the Incarnate Logos.

(2) Hippolytus: (.c. 237) It is worth noticing that though he was a Bishop of Rome, Hippolytus wrote in Greek and was thinking as a Greek Father. In his "Philosophoumena or Réfutation of Haeresies"

1.

Adv. Haer. V. 21, 3.

2.

Aulen G. *Christus Victor*. London 1931 (E.T. by A.G. Hebert)
p.48, also H.E.W. Turner. *The Patristic doctrine of Redemption*
London 1952, p.49.

3.

Irenaeus was the first of the Fathers to speak of the devils rights over men.

4.

Ad. Haer. V, 21, 3.

Hippolytus speaks of Salvation in terms of receiving true knowledge of God , of immortality and deification of man and of having the possibility of imitating Christ.¹ All these undoubtedly refer to the Incarnation of and earthly life of Jesus Christ. It should be said that he speaks of forgiveness of sins as well. Therefore speaking of Incarnation he means the whole saving work of the Incarnate Logos. In other cases Hippolytus refers to Christ's death. In a fragment of his work against Beron and Helicon he speaks of man's Salvation in direct connection to Christ's Death which he does not separate from His Incarnation". God of all things has become man, in order that by suffering in the flesh, which is susceptible to suffering, He might redeem our whole race which was sold to death and that, by working wondrous things by His divinity through the medium of the flesh, He might restore it to that undefiled and blessed life from which it fell away by yielding to the devil".² I think that in Hippolytus also we find the same idea of Incarnation including Christ's Death; and the same idea of man's Salvation as, the result of the whole saving work of Jesus Christ through His Incarnation in the general sense i.e. through His assuming human nature, His Life, His Death and Resurrection.

IV. Alexandrian Theologians

(1) Clement of Alexandria. (ante 216) In him we meet with deeper understanding of Salvation. Clement says again and again that Christ is

1. Philosoph^{ou}ymena (or Refutation of Hæresies) last chapter - cf. Discourse on the Holy Theophany, 8.

2. Fragn. 2. P.G. 10, 833 - cf. 4,59. - Disc. on Theoph. 10.

our Salvation and propitiation.¹ We are saved only through Christ who died as "Victim" for us.² Therefore His death was a sacrifice for our salvation. That is why Clement says that we are saved and redeemed through the Blood of the Lord.³ This sacrifice was a real ransom⁴ which was equivalent of all.⁵ Christ died instead of us.⁶ Thus His Death ought to be our death⁷ and as we were enslaved to the Serpent, the Lord willed to free us. After He was Incarnate, He mastered the Serpent, enslaved the tyrant namely Death, and this is the strangest of all - when He has His hands stretched on the Cross, He freed man who was bound to corruption.⁸ In all these passages Clement lays much stress on the Death of Christ. But this side of Clement's teaching is not the only one. He asserts that Salvation comes to man through the Incarnate Logos, Jesus Christ, and lays stress upon the life and character, the teaching and the example of the Logos in His Incarnate life.⁹ In the fullest sense Salvation comes only through the Incarnate Logos.¹⁰ Through the Incarnate man receives the "true Knowledge" which makes man free. Without the Incarnation man would not have fulfilled the true goal of his being.¹¹ Undoubtedly Clement speaks of Knowledge not in the abstract philosophical sense but in a new special sense of a real inner relation between God and man in such a way that man cannot be saved but by God through the Incarnate Logos. He speaks of "Knowledge" in terms of man's real Salvation.

(2) Origen. (f 254) When we come to Origen, the founder of Scholarly

1. Paedagogos. III, 12, 98.
 2. Stromat. V. 10, 70.
 3. Paedng. I. 5, 23.
 4. Paedng. I. 5, 23
 5. Quis Dives salvetur? 37.
 6. Q.D.S. 23.

7. Ibid.
 8. Protrept. XI, 3.
 9. Paedng. I, 3, 9.
 10. Rashdall. op.c. p.224.
 11. Paedng. I. 3, 7.

Dogmatics, we meet with some interesting ideas. He was the first to say that Christ's death was a "Ransom" paid to the devil in exchange for men's souls.¹ "Men needed a Ransom because they had fallen into captivity." (In Ioan. 1, 39. P.G. 14, 91). Thus Men belonged to God because He created them and they have become slaves of Satan because they had sold themselves to sin". (In Exod. hom. VI, 9 P.G. 12, 338). Christ came to redeem us with His own Blood from Him who had bought us". (In Ioan, VI, 35) and thus Christ became our Ransom. (In Rom. III, 7.) But "to Whom did our Saviour give His soul save the devil for he held us until Christ's soul was given to him as the Ransom of our deliverance." (In Matth: XVI, 8 P.G. 13, 1397-1400). But Christ is stronger than devil and death. He rose again and broke the gates of hell and made us participants of His Resurrection. (Ibid. 13/1116). Origen took his ideas of Ransom from the Gospel of Matthew 20, 28. This idea was also held by Gregory of Nyssa, and St. Basil. A similar idea is to be found in Augustine who teaches that the devil had no right over man without permission from God who overcame him and freed man by righteousness.² We find such ideas also in Leo³ and generally in the western Fathers probably because of their relation to the Roman conception of Law. Later Anselm rejected it in his work "Cur Deus Homo?". At the end, according to Origen, Christ triumphed over the devil and death.⁴

This conception

-
1. Com. in Matth. 20, 28. T.XVI. 8.
 2. De Trinitate XIII, XII, 16-17.
 3. Sermon. XXII.
 4. In Matth. Tom. 16, 8 - In Rom. Tom. 2, 13.

of Christ's work as consisting in a struggle with the demonic forces....

... plays a big part in Origen's Soteriology.¹ However Origen asserts that after His Incarnation the Logos is our teacher, our law-giver and our model² and thus by being united with Him we become rational and divinely possessed³ and are able to participate in the divine nature⁴.

Origen puts this idea clearly when he says: "Discoursing in bodily form and giving Himself out as Flesh, He summons to Himself those who are flesh, in order that He may first of all transform them into likeness of the Word Who has been made Flesh and after that may exalt them so as to behold Him as He was before He became Flesh."⁵ In the same work Origen

says: "With Jesus, human and divine nature began to be woven together, so that by fellowship with Divinity human nature might become divine not only in Jesus Himself but also in all those who believe and embrace the life which Jesus taught."⁶ Origen also speaks of Salvation in terms of forgiveness of sins, of propitiation, of reconciliation.⁷ Christ

took upon Himself our sins and our punishment so that we might be saved through Him.⁸ By the sacrifice of His Body He made God propitious

to man".⁹ Jesus died for us as the Lamb of God and thus He took away the sins of the world."¹⁰ "Sin called for a propitiation and Christ

stepped forward as a Victim spotless and Innocent propitiating the Father to men by His generous self-oblation."¹¹ It is really difficult to make

1. Kelly, op. c. 185. This idea is not the only one in Origen's theology.

2. De Princip. 4,1,2 - 4,3,12.

3. In Ioan. 1, 37, 268.

4. De Princip. 4,4,4.

5. C. Cels. 6,68.

6. C. Cels. 3,28.

7. In Levit. Hom. 9,10 - In Rom. Tom. 3, 8.

8. In Ioan. Tom. 28,14.

9. In Rom. 3, 8.

10. In Ioan. 28, 25.

11. In Num. Homil. 24 in Rom. 3, 8.

a synthesis of all the conception of Origen's teaching.¹ But, if we combine all ideas which we have found in Origen, we have his general understanding of man's salvation through the whole saving work of the Incarnate Logos, i.e. His assuming human nature, His Birth, His Life on earth, His Death and His Resurrection.

- (3) Athanasius (260-339). In Athanasius the Soteriological doctrine has an important place. In his treatise "De Incarnatione Verbi" he deals especially with this question. It has been said that Athanasius speaks of Salvation only in terms of Christ's Incarnation. I do not refuse that Athanasius lays stress on Christ's Incarnation in the narrow sense, as the means through which man's nature is united with the divine is elevated, and deified and that this is what he means when he writes "God became man that we may become Gods" (De Incarnatione Verbi, 3, 1.) However, I think that this teaching does not represent the whole Athanasian doctrine of Salvation. In the above mentioned treatise, Athanasius expressed his whole conception of Salvation. "The Logos knowing that the corruption of men could not be undone, unless at all costs there was a death; and because it was not possible for the Logos to die, being immortal and the Son of the Father; for this reason He takes to Himself the Body that can die, so that this body, participating in the Logos who is above all, may become liable to death on behalf of all and on account of the indwelling Logos, may remain immortal, and in future the corruption may cease in all by the grace of His Resurrection. Whence, as a Victim and a sacrifice free from all blemish, carrying into

1. Mozley, op. c. p.102.

death the body which He took unto Himself, He made death to disappear in all his likes by the offering of an equivalent..... and thus the incorruptible Son of God dwelling with all through that which was like them, fittingly clothed all with incorruptibility in the promise of His Resurrection".¹ As we see the Incarnation, Death and Resurrection of Christ are here linked together and it is only in terms of them all that Athanasius speaks of Salvation. Death would be impossible without presupposing the reality of the Incarnation. All events of Christ's earthly life are inseparable. The benefits of Salvation are expounded in the whole life of our Saviour. "All our sufferings were laid on Him who could not suffer and He destroyed them". (Orat. c. Arian. III 34, Col. 395). "He destroyed death by death and all human weakness by His human actions". (Ibid. 57, col. 445). This is the way to understand the representative character of Christ's death and Sacrifice,² and the possibility of man's Salvation in Christ. Christ was born for us, lived on earth for us, died for us, rose for us, for the confirmation of our resurrection. Christ's death was due not to His own weakness but to the fact that He died for man's salvation.³ As we see while Athanasius speaks of the Incarnation and insists that "God became man that we may become Gods", (Ibid. 3,1.) at the same time he says that "Christ offered the sacrifice on behalf of all, delivering His own shrine to death instead of all that He might set all free from the liability of the original transgression",⁴ and he speaks of Christ's sacrifice offered

1. De Incarnatione Verbi 9, 1.

2. De Incarnat. Verbi 9, 3.

3. Ibid. 21-25.

4. Ibid. 20.

for redemptions of our sins. (De Incarn. Verbi 6, 10. Orat. c. Arians II, 7) and from corruption.¹ For Athanasius Christ's death is as important as His Incarnation in the narrow sense. At least Christ's death retains a place of importance in the plan of Salvation. (Harnack, op.c. II 158, note 2). Immortality came to men through Death. Christ paid our debt for us, for our Salvation. (Orat. 2, 66. De Incarn. 54). However, Athanasius means the whole saving work of Jesus Christ on earth when he speaks of Christ's Incarnation.

At any rate in Athanasius we meet with the synthesis of the two ideas of immortality or reconstitution of our nature, and the idea of expiation of our death.²

V' Antiorigenist Theologians

(1) Methodius of Olympus: (A.D.300). Being an opponent of Origenism, Methodius was mainly a follower of Irenaeus. He speaks of Salvation in a synthetic way. In his *Conviv. Virginorum* he says: "The Logos has assumed the nature of man in order that, having overcome the serpent, man might by Himself reverse the condemnation unto death that had been pronounced against him. For it was fitting that the evil one should be overcome by no other, but by him whom he had deceived, and whom he was boasting that he had subdued. Because in no other way was it possible that sin and the condemnation should be destroyed, unless that same man, on whose account it had been said, "Dust thou art and into dust thou shall return", should be created anew and undo the sentence which had gone forth against all."³ The ideas of Christ's "assuming human nature" and His "destroying sin and death" help us to see Methodius' understanding of Salvation as being realized through the Incarnation in the general sense, i.e. through the

1. De Incarn. Verbi 9, 1

2. Riviere op. c. p.146.

3. *Conviv. Virgin.* 3, 6.

whole saving work of the Incarnate Logos.

The Antiochene Theologians.

Eusebius of Caesarea (260-339)

In Eusebius for the first time we meet with the idea of Christ's death as a substitutionary punishment. Christ "being punished on our account and enduring a retribution owed not by Him but by us, on account of the abundance of our offences, was constituted for us the cause of the forgiveness of our sins, having drawn upon Himself the curse which was awarded to us and becoming a curse on our behalf".¹ He speaks about the death of Christ while he shows a great dependence on the Old Testament in his conception of Christ's sacrifice, and refers to Christ's death as "wiping away our sins".² However when Eusebius examines the question of how it happened that Christ died instead of all men, he is led to the conception of the effect produced upon humanity by the close connexion or identity of our humanity with that of Christ.³ This is to be understood only in and through Christ's Incarnation in the narrow sense, i.e. through His assuming human nature and uniting it to divine Nature in Himself. That is why Eusebius speaks of the Divine Plan of Salvation and of the cause of the Incarnation of the Son of God. God enlightens and radiates all by his Logos. And because no angel was able to bring salvation to men the Logos was sent by the Father to earth. He preached and led men to eternal life. Eusebius sees the purpose of the Incarnation in the extension of God's Kingdom, and in the forgiveness of our sins by Christ's becoming a curse for us, and by the offering of Himself as a sacrifice to God for the whole world". (Evang. Dem. 12.)

1. Demonstratio Evang. X. I. P.G. 22, 724.

2. Ibid. IV, 10, I, 12.

3. Ibid. IV, I. Rashdall op. c. p.302.

Therefore both the Incarnation and the Death of our Lord are linked together in Eusebius when he speaks of man's Salvation.

(2) Cyril of Jerusalem (315-386)

Cyril lays stress on Christ's death and Righteousness, when he speaks of both man's Salvation, and man's sin which Christ took upon Himself.¹ This act of God shows His "philanthropia", His Love for men. "Men were enemies of God and the sinner should have died. It was necessary for God either to remain true and so destroy all men, or to show his philanthropia and to change His decision. But, you can see God's Wisdom, He kept both i.e. truth with decision and act with philanthropia. Christ took our sins on His Body on the tree.² Christ took upon Himself the sins of the whole world in order to raise men up in righteousness.³ Christ was able to do this because "the iniquity of our sins was not so great as the righteousness of Him Who died for us. We did not sin so much as He Who laid down His soul for us did righteously".⁴ However, in Cyril as in the other Fathers, the other part of teaching of the Incarnation in the general sense has its rightful place.⁵ Our Salvation depends on Christ's manhood.⁶ If Christ's human nature is not real we are not saved.⁷ The Incarnation and the Passion of our Lord have the same object, our Redemption.⁸ In the above mentioned passage (note 3) there is an internal relationship between the Death of Christ through which sin was destroyed and His Incarnation which enabled

1. Catech. 3, 12.

2. Catech. 13, 33.

3. Catech. 3, 12.

4. Catech. 13, 33.

5. Riviere op. c. I' p.202.

6. Riviere I. 197.

7. Catech. XII, 1-8.

8. Catech. 4. cf. also Grenstedt op. c. 189.

Him to undergo death for man's Salvation. For this reason Cyril says that it was on account of our sins that the Son of God came down from haeven..... it was for our sins that He was crucified"¹.

Here the ideas of Incarnation and Death of Christ are identical. Stress is laid on both as one. Salvation came through both.

(3) John Chrysostom (347-407)

Chrysostom was an excellent preacher, and a practical theologian. When he preaches, theologizes and when he theologizes the preaches. He sees the fulfilment of man's Salvation both in the Incarnation (in the narrow sense) and in the sacrificial death of Christ.² The goal of the Incarnation was that men might be able to become sons of God.³

He speaks clearly and insists on the truth that "Christ took our flesh solely through love to have pity on us"⁴ and so he refers to the very fact of Christ's Incarnation. Thus the saving work of the Incarnate Logos was to deliver men from evil and to offer them all good things which He alone was able to offer.⁵ It was the only-begotten Son of God, Jesus Christ, who took upon Himself our curses so that we might be no longer accused.⁶ Thus all men who were accused and condemned are now free through Christ⁷ because Christ's death was "equivalent to the death of all"⁸ and because He had paid down far more than we owe - even as the illimitable ocean is more than a little drop.⁹ Following Gregory

-
1. Catech. IV. 9.
 2. In Ep. ad. Hebr. Hom. 5, 1.
 3. Grenstend op. c. p.190.
 4. In Hebr. Hom. V. 1.
 5. In Galat. Hom. IV.
 6. In Evang. Ioan. Hom. 11, 2.
 7. In Ep. ad. Galat. Hom. P.G. LXI 646
 8. In Ep. ad. Hebr. Hom. 17, 2.
 9. In Ep. ad. Rom. Hom. 10, 2.

of Nyssa, Chrysostom says: "If a tyrant who inflicts great sufferings on all who fall into his hands should attack the King or the King's Son and put him to death unjustly, that death may avenge all the rest".¹ John Chrysostom asserts that Christ died for us all,² and goes on to explain that He died for each of us and that He could die even "for one".³ Our sins were the cause of His Death.⁴ Christ became our ransom and delivered us from satan.⁵ His Sacrifice reconciled us to God and God to us, for where there is sacrifice there is remission of sins.⁶ And because we subject to sin and its penalty, Christ by His Passion abolished both the sin and the penalty.⁷ Now, if we combine Chrysostom's ideas about Christ's Incarnation and His death, and see them together, then in spite of his laying more stress on death, we meet here again the patristic conception of Salvation. Chrysostom speaks of the Incarnation and the Sacrificial Death of Christ when he refers to man's Salvation. And being a good preacher he was able to expound his teaching in a wonderful way.

(4) Epiphanius (315-403)

In St. Epiphanius we find the same synthesis of ideas, concerning the saving work of Christ, and man's Salvation. Thus he says: "No man could save us. For this reason the Lord took flesh of our flesh and the Logos became a man like us, that He might give us Salvation through His Divinity and suffer for us through His Humanity, suffering by His Passion and slaying death by His death".⁸ Here Man's Salvation is considered as

1. In Evang. Iodn. Hom. LXVIII 2-3.

2. In Ioam. Hom. IX, 1.

3. In Gal. Hom. 11, 8.

4. In Matth. Hom. IXXXII, 1.

5. In Matth. Hom. IXV, 4.

6. Hom. I de Cruce et Latrone.

7. Col. Hom. VI. 3.

8. Ancoratus, XCIII, P.G. XIII. 185-188.

realised through Christ's Incarnation and His Death, through the Union of Divinity and Humanity in Jesus Christ. And since the eternal Logos took flesh of our flesh, He "came to bear our sins on the wood on which He gave Himself for us, and His Blood redeemed us and His Body blotted out our curse".¹ However, the Logos could not suffer except only through His Humanity which He united to Himself through the Incarnation. And as we cannot speak of Christ's Blood apart from the Incarnation, Epiphanius says that Salvation was realised through the whole saving work of the Incarnate Logos, i.e. His assumption of Flesh, His Life, His Death.

VII The Cappadocian Fathers.

(1) St. Basil the Great (329-379)

St. Basil's contribution to the Soteriological dogma was not very important in spite of his great fame as an Antiarrian theologian. However, he embraces the whole question fully. If the Lord did not come in Flesh, then the Redeemer did not give any ransom to death, nor did He by His power break the rule of death. For if the nature held in thrall by death were other than the nature assumed by Christ, then death would not have ceased its rule, the Sufferings of His divine flesh would not have been to our profit, He would not have slain sin in His flesh, we should not have been restored to life in Christ - we who had died in Adam - what had fallen would not have been raised, what had been fallen would not have been mended, what had been far from God would not again have been made nigh unto Him."²

In this passage St. Basil speaks of man's Salvation in terms both of remission of sin, and of offering of a new life, therefore he speaks of

1. Adv. Haereses. IXVI. 79 P.G. XIII, 153.

2. Ep. CCLXI, 2.

Christ's assuming the human Flesh, i.e. His Incarnation and of His Death and Passion. In other cases St.Basil says that Christ came and became mortal to deliver men from mortality and make them partakers of heavenly life.¹ By Christ's coming in the flesh, the new life of the faithful and victory over sin are internally linked together. St.Basil speaks also of Christ's death as a ransom. "Sinners are under the rule of satan, who is scrutinizing souls at the moment of their death... Even a small (sin) would be dangerous if we had not someone who pays our ransom and thus save us" (Hom. in Psalm VII, 2. P.G. 29, 232). Men have lost their freedom being vanquished by the devil who holds them captives". (Hom. in Psalm. XIVIII, 3.) Basil does not say that Christ offered His soul to the devil but to God. (Riviere 123.) "What can a man find worthy enough to offer as ransom? However, something was found which was equivalent for all men and which was offered for our Salvation i.e. the holy and most valuable Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which He shed for us all and since no man can save us therefore He who redeemed us is not (simply) man² because the Redeemer should be far better than the redeemed one".³ Christ's death is to be understood in terms of His Incarnation on which stress is laid by St.Basil. It is in His being God and man that Christ deified the human race".⁴.

(2) Gregory of Nazianzus (325-389)

St.Gregory also sees the question of Salvation as a whole. Sometimes he lays stress on Christ's death as a Ransom.⁵ But he

1. Epist. VIII, 5.

2. In Psalm. XIVIII, 4.

3. In Psalm. IXVIII, 3 - Epist. CCIXI, 2.

4. Summary of Faith (attributed to St.Basil, P.G. 30, 834)

5. Orat. XXX, 20. - (2)

strongly repudiated the idea of the Ransom paid to satan. "To whom I am asking, was Christ's Blood offered? If it was to the devil how shocking would be the thought! How can we believe that he would not only receive a ransom from God, but actually received God Himself as the ransom, as a salary for his tyranny which had already passed all measures". (Orat. XIV, 22, P.G. 36, 653). The notion of the devil's rights though it found some supporters was at no time universal in the Church. (Riviere, op. c. II. 129).

However Gregory does not say to whom this ransom was offered. Can we suppose that it was given to God the Father? In this case two questions arise: how? as it was not the Father who held men captives, and then how could the Father be pleased with the shedding of 'His' Son's blood.¹ There is no positive answer. Christ became for us "very sin and very curse"² although He was not "sin" Himself.³ However, while speaking of Christ's Death, St. Gregory connects it with the Incarnation of the Logos and both aspects are related to man's Salvation. Thus St. Gregory points out that it was for our sake that humanity might be sanctified by the humanity of God.⁴ This sanctification of man's nature was realized through its Union with the Divinity of Christ. St. Gregory sums up his doctrine in his famous phrase "What is not received, is not saved". As Salvation consists in a reformation and restoration of our nature, our Saviour accomplished this work by physically uniting Himself with our humanity by His Incarnation. "He carries us bodily in Himself with all that is in us; He is the heaven mixed with our paste in order to transform it entirely". Orat. 30, 6.

1. Orat. XIV, 22.

2. Orat. 37, 1.

3. Orat. 37, 1.

4. Orat. XIV, 22.

"He dies but He gives life and destroy's death". (Orat. 29, 20.)

So the Salvation of man is the result of Christ's work. Incarnation and Death. "We were in need of the Incarnation and death of a God in order to have life". (Orat. XIV, 22.) And when St. Gregory says of "Christ Who gave Himself instead of us"¹, or the idea of representation or substitution is to be understood in the light of the teaching about Christ as the Head of His body. Salvation and Christ's whole saving work are linked together in St. Gregory of Nazianzus. Generally speaking St. Gregory sees a salutary meaning in the whole work of the Incarnate Logos. (Riviere I. 208).

(3) Gregory of Nyssa (335-395)

Gregory of Nyssa was the most philosophical of the Greek Fathers and the doctrine of Salvation is prominent in his teaching. Gregory insists that it was only the Theanthropos who was able to save man because the Saviour must have been the real God² in order to lead human nature, to elevate it through its unity with the divine, and to deify it. He elaborated the idea of Christ's death as a ransom paid to satan³. In Gregory's teaching man's Salvation is realized through Christ. The Incarnation in the narrow sense, and Death are linked together, and it was through both that Salvation was fulfilled. Thus Gregory says: "Being good the Deity shows pity for him who has fallen, and being wise is not ignorant of the means for his recovery: justice must also form part of that wisdom, for no one would associate true justice apart from wisdom. What, then, under these circumstances is

1. Orat. XXX, 5.

2. Oratio Catech. Magna, 8.

3. Ibid. 23. P.G. XIV. 60-66.

justice? It is the refusal to exercise any arbitrary sway over him who has us in his power; the refusal to tear us away by the superiority of force from him, and so to leave some colour of justification to him who has enslaved man The enemy beholding in Him such power, saw also that what he had the opportunity to obtain in Him, was something greater than what he expected. For this reason he chooses Him as a ransom for those who were shut up in the prison of death. But it was beyond his power to look on the aspect of God, face to face, except by looking at some portion of that fleshly nature which through sin he had so long held in bondage. Therefore the Deity invests Himself with flesh, in order, to ensure that he, by looking upon something, like nature and akin to himself, might have no fears in approaching that supernatural power; and might yet by perceiving that power, exhibiting as it did, although only by gradual stages, more and more splendour in the miracles, deem what was seen an object of desire rather than of fear. "Thus you see how goodness was united with justice and how wisdom was not divorced from them".¹ The deception practised by the devil is emphasized. We also find the idea of the Hook-metaphor. According to Gregory "in order to ensure that the thing offered in exchange on our behalf might be the more easily accepted by him who demanded it, the Deity was hidden under the veil of our nature; so that, as with greedy fish, the hook of Deity might be gulped down along with the bait of flesh and thus, life being introduced into the house of death, and light shining in darkness, all that opposes light and life might vanish away."² The whole idea in Gregory becomes much stronger than in origen. Here God and devil come to a contract. However, Gregory's

1. Orat. Catech. Magna. 22, 23.

2. Ibid. 24.

teaching of Salvation is linked together not only with Christ's assumption of human nature but also with His Death and His Resurrection. Not only does he speak of Christ's offering His Body in place of humanity¹ but he also speaks of Christ's death as an "exchange of our death".² There is the idea of substitution "Christ is our Redeemer because He gave Himself as ransom for us". (De Perf. Christiani forma P.G. XVI, 261). "Christ is the holy innocent spotless and sinless Priest who offered Himself to God in the name and in the stead of mankind"..... Thereby He became the ransom of many, or rather the ransom of all nations. (De Occursu Domini, P.G. XVI, 1161). The place of Christ's death and Resurrection is not only important but also necessary. It was with Christ that all men rose since the part which is Christ's body, and which is consubstantial with ours, stands for the whole "as though all nature were one living thing"³. Here Incarnation and Resurrection are inseparable. Gregory also speaks of Christ as having become for us sin and a curse.⁴ He does not ignore the idea of Redemption through the Cross.⁵ The teaching of Christ's death as a ransom⁶ can be understood only through His Incarnation. Gregory expresses his whole teaching on our questions when he says: "Christ became man, destroyed our enemy sin, and reconciled us to the father". (De occursu Domini, XVI, 1173). His sacrifice was expiatory. Therefore Salvation came as a result of the whole saving work of Jesus Christ. (Orat. Magna, 17.).

In this chapter, I have tried very briefly to point out how the Greek Fathers understood the great problem of Christ's Saving Work and man's Salvation. One may find some special characteristic in the teaching

1. De Occursu Domini. P.G. (46) XVII, 1165.
 2. Adversus Eunomium. 5, P.G. XIV, (45) 693.
 3. Orat. Catech. Magna, 32 - Mozley op. c. p. 110.
 4. Adv. Eunom. 11 -
 5. Riviere op. c. p.159 - Grensted, op. c. p.183.

6. De Occursu Domini.
 P.G. XVI, 1173.

of each Father. But at no time one idea absorbed other ideas completely from the teaching of the Fathers. They all have this in common: they consider man's salvation as fulfilled through the whole saving work of the Incarnate Logos - through His Assumption of Human Nature, His earthly life, His Work, His Teaching, His Sufferings, His Sacrificial Death, His glorious Resurrection and His Eternal Mediatorship in Heaven. The Fathers have seen man's salvation as a whole, as a great mystery. That is why they have not tried to explain this mystery. They were sure that it was only through Jesus Christ that man is saved. For them, there is only one Saviour, the Incarnate Logos. Now after this very short survey of 'patristic soteriological' teaching, we can see Cyril's position and evaluate his contribution to the history of this dogma. This thesis is dealing with Cyril's Soteriology.

THE
SOTERIOLOGY
OF
CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA

EXLIBRIS

13112101

PART ONE

MAN'S NEED FOR SALVATION

First Section

Adam and his original state

Chapter One

The Cause and the Goal of Man's Creation

Soteriology, dealing with Salvation of man, is directly connected with Anthropology, i.e. with the doctrine of Man.¹ Without man as a real being, sinful and corrupted, we cannot speak of his salvation. Therefore Anthropology is a necessary presupposition of Soteriology. Christian theology has always had a doctrine of Man. As Christ discovered God to man, He also revealed to us the real mystery of Man. Since Jesus Christ we know what man really is.²

We cannot either understand or value the great redemptive work of the Incarnate Logos, Jesus Christ, unless we know man's original state, his corruption and the loss of his gifts because of his sin and his absolute need for Salvation. It is for this reason that in the first part of this work I deal with Cyril's teaching about Man and particularly man's creation, original state, Image of God in Man, his sin and the destructive consequences of his sin. The question of man's creation in Cyril's teaching is to be considered within the whole problem of creation under two aspects: Creation in relation to God the Creator and Creation in relation to Man the creature. In the work of man's creation we see three stages: God's eternal plan or idea of creation of man, the act of creation, and the results of creation.

A'. According to Cyril, creation of Man was an act of God's free Will "God's Will was sufficient for the creation of everything".³ God's Will is to be understood as a cause existing within God. God created man because He willed so and not of necessity. Therefore it was not

1. Arnold Gehlen. Anthropologische Forschung. München 1961. p.7.

2. Adam K. Der Christus des Glaubeus, Tübingen, 1954 (Et. by J. Crick. N.York, 1957. p.330).

3. Dial. de Trinit. IX. P.G. 75, 1157. "Μόνη βούλησις τῷ Θεῷ ἤρκεσεν εἰς..δημιουργία

is understood by Cyril only in the sense that the difference between God and Man as far as their nature is concerned is not only quantitative but also qualitative. It is only the Three Persons of the Holy Trinity who are of the same Substance. Man is an "adopted Son of God".

Speaking of Creation "out of nothing" Cyril does not understand the creation as a production out of nothing as if this "nothing" were a substance out of which God formed the created world and Man. In Cyril, creation out of nothing means creating without using any pre-existing material. "Thus Cyril says." Material was not co-eternal with God, nor unborn like God, nor co-existed with God the Eternal, since it has been.

Cyril speaking of creation "out of nothing" he does not understand creation as a production out of nothing as if this "nothing" were a substance out of which God formed the created world and man. In Cyril, like in all the other Fathers, creation out of nothing means creation "without using any pre-existing material".

"Matter was not co-eternal with God, nor unborn like God, nor co-existed with God the Eternal, since it has been brought once into existence, though God ever existed. Nor was the changeable material similar to God who is always the same and unchangeable, nor was the corruptible similar to the incorruptible God. But the material world was brought from not being into existence according to God's Will. Again we do not say that God formed the world only from pre-existing material, but with His divine Power He brought into existence that which did not exist before at all".¹

In this passage, the phrase "He brought into existence that which

1. Adv. Julianum II'. P.G. 76, 584. "Ὁὐ συνάναρχον καὶ συναΐδιον τῷ Θεῷ καὶ ἀγέννητον ἐφίησι καὶ αὐτός ὁ Μωϋσῆς νοεῖσθαι τὴν ὕλην, "χρόνῳ δὲ μᾶλλον περιορίζει τὴν κτίσιν ὡς ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐπενηγμένην κατὰ βούλησιν Θεοῦ.."

did not exist before at all" does not mean a mere formulation of pre-existing material but a real bringing into existence of what did not exist before".

How God created the world and especially man, remains a mystery which "should be accepted by faith". Cyril says: "The Holy Scripture says that God created man. Therefore it is true and beyond doubt and we accept it by faith. But how, whence or from what God created the world, heaven and earth and all creation is not injurious to discuss. What the Bible says not very clearly should be accepted in silence."¹

While all that we have said hitherto speaks of a Cause, it does not however speak of final goal of man's creation.

We cannot, however, separate these two ideas, i.e. the cause from the goal of man's creation.

Since man was created by the free Will of God and not by fate, it is necessary to think of an "end" in man's creation. God is the absolutely rational Being and His actions cannot be unreasonable. God is wise.²

Furthermore the question of the end or purpose of the world - and therefore of man, as well, is directly implied in the Christian faith in God as Love. The world - man, as well, - has its end in the Love of God.³

That is why in writings Cyril presents a special purpose and End of man's creation. And this end should be, no doubt, the best

-
1. C. Anthropomorphitas B' P.G. 76, 1080. "παρατρέχειν ἐν σωπῇ"
 2. De Incarnat. C' P.G. 75, 1421. "ὁ σοφὸς τῶν ὅλων πρῶτανις".
 3. Hearing Th. Der Christliche Glauben. E.T. by J. Dickie - G. Ferries, London 1915. Vol. I, p.390.

of goals, a goal worthy of God and best for man's happiness. "We have been created in order to adore Him alone and to offer Him our hymns of thankfulness."¹

Cyril finds the special goal of man's creation in God Himself, in His Glory, in the glorification of His Name and of His properties.

If the end of man were outside of God, then He would appear as dependent. But God, because of His perfection, is worthy of any glorification. Since there is nothing else greater than God, we can easily find the end of creation, not in creation, but in God. Faith in the Revelation of the Love of God in Christ assures the Christian Church that the world-man, as well - has its purpose and source in God, that is for God and from God.²

Man does belong to God. His end is found in his remaining faithful to his Creator, in his being in harmony with his God, and in the glorification of God's name. Cyril speaks of man in terms of a creature and understands the relation between God and man as the relation between Creator and creature. "The world is the property of God because it has been created by God."³ Cyril finds man's end in God's gratification when he speaks on man's part. On the other hand God has no need at all and so He need not any glorification externally from any creature. He is the God of Glory by Himself.

Man in glorifying God does not add any more glory or any more happiness to the Creator because He is the Happiness.⁴

-
1. In Isafam 45, 18-19 P.G. 70, 977." Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ γεγόναμεν , ἵνα προσκυ-
/νῶμεν αὐτῷ καὶ μόνῳ".
 2. Haering op. c. 415.
 3. In Ioannem Evang. I, 11 P.G. 73, 152." Ἰδιος ὁ σύμπαρ κόσμος ἐστὶ τῷ Θεῷ
/κατὰ τὸν τοῦ πεποιθῆσθαι λόγον".
 4. Ibid. 8, 54. P.G. 73, 928.

Man glorifies God and is conscious of what he is doing because he is a rational being.¹

Man was created in a special and different way from all other creatures, and so he was especially honoured.²

Finally, God's Glorification is considered by Cyril, even as the end of the whole of creation." God is glorified through all His creation³. Man and the whole creation manifest God's glory since they show the fulfilment of God's Will⁴ and manifest the Attributes of God, His Wisdom, His Power, His Love.⁵

God's glory is manifested by itself in creation. To this objective aspect of God's glorification, man, as a rational creature adds only his desire for a subjective glorification of God. Man does more perfectly what nature can do elementarily. And so all creation glorifies God in all ways.

While Cyril finds man's first and main goal in God and in His Glory, he, nevertheless, examines the same question of man's creation from another aspect, and finds another, secondary, end of man's creation. Cyril says: "True knowledge of God is connected with God's glorification.⁶ The more man knows God, the more he loves and glorifies Him.

This knowledge is not a mere intellectual knowledge of God but a real new Life in which man obtains all the Blessing and Grace of God. Thus he, desiring his end in God, desires his blessedness and happiness because nothing is good and happy except as far as it

1. Glaphyra 1, 5. P.G. 69. "...τῶν εἰδόντων δοξολογεῖν".

2. In Isaïam 2, 8. P.G. 70, 81. "τετίμηκεν ὁ τῶν ὅλων Θεὸς αὐτουργία τὸν ἄνθρωπον".

3. De Trinit. Dial. IV'. P.G. 75, 897.

4. De Vivif. Trinit. 14. P.G. 75, 1157.

5. Adv. Julian. 7. P.G. 76, 861. In Isaïan. 16, 8. P.G. 70, 413.

6. Ibid. 7. P.G. 76, 861. "Ζωὴ ἡ Γνώσις".

participates in the beatitude of God.

This real knowledge about which Cyril speaks is the state in which man is in union with God. This union is the source of true blessedness and of real beatitude for man; god is the Cause of all good things.¹ So to fulfil man's end here means to participate in God's blessedness. Cyril expresses this idea more clearly in another passage. "In the beginning God created man in His image ... in order that he may live in happiness and holiness². Glory of God, happiness of man and virtuous life are inseparable in Cyril's teaching. Holy life is the best expression of Glory to God. Holiness was given to man by God.³ Real happiness consists in the possession of a desirable good. The subjective end of man may be his happiness. The objective goal of man is the glory of God. But God is man's happiness. So God becomes also the Subjective end of man, as well. Man apart from God is not real man. Man fulfils his personality only in God since He is the basis of man's existence. The two elements, holiness and happiness, are inseparable since holiness, in other words, man's union with God, makes man really and truly happy.

It is God who, in His eternal love, puts into man's heart the great desire for virtue. Even more, all good gifts are given to man by God in order that man may always live in holiness, blessedness and in happiness.

-
1. Adv. Julian VII. P.G. 76, 861. "ἀπάντων αἴτιος καὶ δοτὴρ τῶν καλῶν".
 2. In Ioan. 1, 1-2. P.G. 71, 601.
 3. De Trinit. Dial. VI. P.G. 75, 1016.
"κτίσει μὲν καὶ ποιήμασι δοτὴς ὁ ἁγιασμός".

Since God is Love and not simply "good" but goodness itself, His Love is manifested in the cause and in the fulfilment of the goal of Man's creation. God willed to create the human world as the area where His glory could be manifested and this glorious manifestation was to be the source of man's happiness. If God is Love, His end and ours coincide.¹

This union, this relation between man and God, cannot be static; it is progressive. The more man's end is fulfilled, the more man's happiness becomes greater. This union, and therefore this happiness becomes perfect in Christ. This idea leads us to understand the relation between man's creation and man's re-creation through Jesus Christ, in other words, the relation between creation and redemption of men in Cyril's theology.

We can see this relation where Cyril lays stress upon both sides of Christian Salvation, i.e. upon the negative one, the deliverance from sin and upon the positive one, man's participation in divine blessedness.

Man's salvation in Christ becomes the real fulfilment and completion of the work and the goal of creation since salvation means restoration of all gifts given by God to man at the moment of His creation, which gifts were corrupted and destroyed because of man's sin.² The goal of man, which was given by God at creation, and which was hindered for a little while because of sin, was completed in Christ.³

1. Hearing op. c. p.365.

2. In Genesin 1 P.G. 69, 28.

3. In Joel. 2, 28. P.G. 71, 377.

" ἡργησε μὲν ἡ ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ δοθεῖσα χάρις , ἀνεχεινίσθη δὲ ἐν Χριστῷ".

Thus Cyril understands the work of salvation in relation to creation. However, the work of man's salvation in Christ was far greater than the work of creation because in Christ man received not only gifts from God but God himself, and through Christ man is justified, although he was personally guilty for his Sin and Fall. Creation was neither reconciliation nor redemption. Salvation in Christ is a real healing¹ and restoration,² destruction of the corruption and reception of the first good things.³ These two aspects of man's goal are inseparable and constitute one final end. Man glorifies God, knows Him more, loves Him more, lives in deeper union with Him, and this union becomes the source of man's happiness now and eternally. There is something more to say. In this unity God communicates His perfections to men according to their measure. God is full of joy in making man a participant of his beatitude. Man tries to acquire God's perfection. So God becomes the end of man even from this point of view. Feeling beatitude in his unity with God and in glorifying God, Man feels the need to glorify God more and more. Both purposes are different aspects of the same purpose. God created man for His glory, not in order to increase His Glory but in order to show it and offer it to men, who glorify God and fulfil their goal and participate in the ultimate good⁴ which is God, as Cyril says,⁵ God shows Himself as

1. Glaph. in Genes. I - P.G. 69, 25. "θεραπεία".

2. In Jonam. A' P.G. 71, 601. "ἐπανόρθωσις".

3. Glaph. in Genes. I 69, 25. "φθορᾶς ἀναίρεσις, τῶν ἐν ἀρχαῖς ἀγαθῶν ἀνάληψις".

4. Trembelas P. Dogmatics of the Orthodox Catholic Church vol. I'. Athens 1959, page 351.

5. In Ioan. 10, 17. P.G. 73, 1053.

the God of Love¹ and Goodness and not as a "mere god of ideas".
Man's creation cannot be understood apart from God's Love.

Cyril finds this special love of God for man in the particular way that he was created with special gifts, i.e. in the Image of God.² It was because of his divine image that man could participate in happiness.³ Cyril is clear in explaining God's desire for the beatitude of man. Man would have been able to live for ever in this first state if he had not rebelled against God.⁴

Both the subjective and objective aspects of the goal of man's creation are identified. Again we can use even another distinction of primary and secondary goal. The primary end of man could be the glory of God, the secondary man's happiness, which could also be called intermediate, while the glory of God is the very ultimate end of man. Even in the second case God is the final goal of man.

1. Ibid. Ibid.

2. Adv. Julian 8. P.G. 76, 925." πεποιήται κατ'εἰκόνα τοῦ πλάσαντος αὐτόν".

3. De Incarn. Unig. 1 P.G. 75, 1421.

4. In Rom. P.G. 74, 792.

ἢ διέμεινεν ἂν ἐν τοῖς ἀρχαίοις τῆς φύσεως ἀγαθοῖς, εἰ μὴ ἐτέτραπτο πρὸς ἀποστασίαν καὶ παρακοήν".

Chapter Two

Image of God in Adam

A.

As we have seen, according to Cyril, man, the consummation of all creatures is constituted of two essential elements, soul and body. "Man constitutes one being, composed of soul and body, the body being of one kind of substance and the soul being of a different substance, each for its own reason, but both coming together to make one living being, and both being not separated at all after their union".¹ According to this man is an undivided whole, one human being: this human being is constituted of two essential elements, soul and body: Cyril puts first soul and then body because "the soul is more honourable than the body".² Each of these two elements is of different substance: Each element is not confused with the other; therefore both do not constitute one element, but each one exists in its character: both, however, are inseparably united and constitute one perfect³ human being, the whole human nature, the whole man: this constitution of one human being is realised only through the union of the two elements together, and not before that. That is why every human being is a new one, unrepeated and unrepeatable. These elements, the one being spiritual and the other material make man the link between the spiritual and the material world.

We have also seen that man was created according to the Image of God and in His likeness.⁴

1. In Ioan. 20, 30. P.G. 74, 737.

2. In Matth. 6, 23. P.G. 72, 384.

3. In Ioan. 14, 20. P.G. 74, 277# πρὸς ἰδιότητα τῆς τελείας φύσεως δι' ἑαυτοῦ

4. In Jean. 1, 1-2 P.G. 72, 384.

" πεποίηκε τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐν ἀρχῇ κατ' εἶδαν εἰκόνα καὶ ὁμοίωσιν ".

I may have to say that in Cyril's teaching "Image" and "Likeness" are mostly used as synonyms and express the general moral and spiritual relationship of Adam to God and the whole original state of Man.¹

A difficult question is to be raised here. What is the relation between the Image of God in man, and the two essential elements of human nature? Where does the Divine Image exist? Does it exist (a) in the whole man, namely in both elements, soul and body, together: (b) or only in man's body: (c) or only in man's soul?

This question is of great importance because it is intimately related to the whole Christian Anthropology, and, therefore, to Soteriology. This is the reason why we have to examine Cyril's understanding of this problem, in order that we may understand his soteriological teaching more easily.

A. In his writings Cyril characterises the "whole man", in general as being created according to the Image of God.²

But when he comes to examine the problem theologically, in detail, then he is very clear in limiting distinctively the Image of God only to the Soul of Man. "The Soul is more honourable than the body because the soul is the Image of God."³ In the greek text the word "Image" put in nominative refers to the word "Soul" put also in nominative. Cyril sees the Image of God only in man's soul. He never calls the human body Image of God; on the contrary, as we shall see later, he denies it categorically.

B. In examining Cyril's writings we find Biblical, Theological, and logical arguments, which he presents in order to explain his teaching

1. In Ioan. 14, 20. P.G. 74, 277.

2. In Ioan. 1, 1-2. P.G. 71, 601.

3. In Matth. 6.23. P.G. 72, 384. "ὡς εἰκών τοῦ Θεοῦ".
 "ἡ ψυχὴ τῆς τοῦ σώματος οὐσίας τιμιωτέρα ἐστίν,"

on this theme with which we are now dealing.

First: Because of ignorance¹ some of the monks in the Mountain Calamon in Egypt had begun spreading strange ideas of an anthropomorphic understanding of some passages of the Holy Scripture, and consequently, of an anthropomorphic understanding of God himself. According to their opinion, as the Bible says that man was created according to the Image of God, we should believe that God is like a man with a human face.² Cyril as the good shepherd, taking care of his spiritual sheep and protecting them from heretical teachings, had no hesitation in writing that such an anthropomorphic understanding of God is nonsense and impious.³ The reason which is Cyril's answer to our question, is contained in the following passage, taken from his work against Anthropomorphism. "Unquestionably man is according to the Image of God. But this likeness (Image) is not corporeal, for God is incorporeal. And the Saviour Himself teaches it by saying God is spirit. If they think that God Himself, who is above all, was formed according to the nature of the human body, let them say whether He has feet to walk, hands with which to work, and eyes with which to see. Where does He move and to which places does He go? He who fills all things? Or which hands does He move, He who creates through the living Logos.

If He, like us has His eyes towards us, then He does not see anything at back, and when He looks towards the East, He does not know

1. C. Anthropomorphitas 1. P.G.76, 1065. "ἐξ ἀμαθείας".

2. Ibid. 76, 1068.

3. Ibid. 76, 1068. "Ἀσύνητον καὶ... ἐσχάτης δυσσεβείας.."

The genuity of this work has been denied. see: Bardenhewer. Patrologie. E.T. by Jh. Shahan. St. Luis, 1908. p.364.

what the people in the West are doing. But let them who say these things, stop their mouths. For God is above all creation. He is not understood either as body, in forms or in bodily shapes, but He is simple, immaterial, formless, uncompounded. He is not composed of members or parts, as we are. He is spirit, according to the Scripture. He is present everywhere and fills all things. He is lacking in nothing, for He fills heaven and earth. But man's having been created in the Image of God has another explanation and another meaning. Because He alone of all living beings on earth is rational, compassionate, capable of any virtue and has superiority over all things on earth, according to the likeness and the Image of God. So the living being (animal man) is said to have been created in the Image of God inasmuch as he can be said to be rational and superior to all things on earth."¹

We have given here this long passage because we wanted to let Cyril himself explain, in his own words, his ideas about our question. Criticising the above passage, we could underline some important points.

Likeness, generally speaking, can be either bodily and corporeal or spiritual and incorporeal. That depends on the quality of the elements between which the likeness exists.

Likeness exists only between elements which are similar (a) either absolutely or relatively, (b) either by nature or by creation and grace. Man's soul is made in the Image of God by creation, by Grace, and not by nature. Man's Soul comes from God².

1. C. Anthropomorphitas. P.G. 76, 1068.

2. This idea neither means that the Soul is of the same substance as God. "We Confess that the soul is not of the same substance with the divine and timeless Nature of God" (In Ioan. 20,33. P.G. 74,737) nor denies the truth that the human body, too, was created by God. Here we have Cyril's answer to the question of Analogia Entis. Man the Image of God not by nature but by creation and he, therefore, is not of the same substance of God. "εἰ καὶ ἀθάνατον ὀριζόμεθα εἶναι τὴν νοερὰν ψυχὴν, ἀλλ' οὐ τῆς θειοτάτης ἐκείνης καὶ ἀνάρχου φύσεως ὁμοούσιον".

the Soul is "more honourable than the body",¹ and while the body was made from the earth, the Soul was created to the Image of God.

If the Divine Image in man were corporeal, then (a) either God should be considered as corporeal and bodily; but God is a Spirit. Or (b) man's body must be considered as spiritual; but man's body is an earthly creature.²

The Divine Image cannot exist in man's body because, if it could, God should be understood in terms of outward forms and shapes, like the body. But God is formless, simple.

The body is composed of many parts, but God is uncompounded.

The existence of many members in the body indicates limitation, but God is limitless.

So, since God is not corporeal, then either there is not any Image of God at all in man, or there is one, which, not existing in man's body, must be found somewhere else in man.

That is why Cyril sees the Image of God only in man's Soul.

Second

In the following passage Cyril brings a second argument in order to show what he explained directly in the passage which we have already examined. "If the Image is according to the form of the body, it is not illogical to say that God is similar even to the Irrational animals. For we see that even these animals are composed of the same parts as we are, having feet, eyes, nose and tongue together with the other members of the body."³

-
1. In Matth. 6, 23. P.G. 72, 384! "Ἡ ψυχὴ τῆς τοῦ σώματος οὐσίας τιμιωτέρα ἐστίν".
 2. In Psalm. 32, 9. P.G. 69, 376. "Γήϊνον πλάσμα καὶ ἐκ γῆς πεπλασμένον".
 3. C. Anthropom A'. P.G. 76, 1068.

Let us suppose for the moment that the Divine Image can exist in the body of man and that God can be anthropomorphic.

The substantial elements of the human body are the same as the elements of the body of the irrational animals. Both have flesh and members. Thus if God is to be found in the human body, then He must be found also in the bodies of the irrational animals.

In this case, God would not be only anthropomorphic but also zoomorphic. (= animal morphic).

Then by looking at the body of an irrational animal we could recognise the Image of God, God Himself. But this idea would be irrational and impious, a blasphemy.

Proportionally the Image of God cannot be in the material bodies either of the animal or of man.

Yet the Divine Image exists really in man. Consequently, not existing in man's body this Image must be found in man's soul.

Third

Cyril comes to another argument which has a logical as well as an organic relation to the other.

If we are images of God according to the idea of virtue, and since this virtue exists in the holy Angels, too, more than in us, then, all rational creation, through holiness and all virtue, becomes the Image of God. Because, if the Divine and Supernatural Beauty is appropriate to us on earth, how much more so is it to the rational Powers in heaven, where God abides? That is why the Holy Scripture calls the Heaven His

Divine Throne.¹ Here we can form a simple syllogism.

The Image of God can be found in the Angels.

The Angels are unquestionably incorporeal spirits.

The Divine Image, therefore is to be found in spirits, incorporeal elements.

This analogy can be transferred to man. The Divine Image is to be found in the spiritual element of man, i.e. in man's Soul.

Fourth

Finally, Cyril uses another argument which seems to be more theological. "We are formed in the Image of God, firstly and most importantly through virtue and holiness, for the Divine is Holy and is the beginning, source and origin of all virtue. If man's having been created in the Image of God resided in the nature of the human body, how would it be possible for people to lose this image? Because we have lost nothing of those elements which are substantial to us. And because holiness and righteousness make us Images of God, we say that those, who never lived in virtue and holiness, have lost this august and excellent beauty."²

We have to examine this passage carefully. Cyril sees an organic - but neither confused nor identified, as we shall see - relation between the Divine Image and the holiness of man.

If the Divine Image were found in the body of man, then the corruption of the Image ought to be followed by the loss of the Substantial elements of the human body.

But the Substance of the human body remains the same; it has not

1. C. Anthrop. P.G. 76, 1089.

2. Ibid. P.G. 76, 1084.

lost its essential elements.

Cyril does not see the Image in man's body.

Conclusion: Cyril (a) characterises generally the whole man as created in the Image of God, but (b) limits distinctively this Divine Image only to man's Soul. After what I have said, we can see the relation between Man and the Image of God. Cyril apparently admits and clearly teaches that both Adam and Eve have been created and formed to the Image of the same God. For both the archetype is Christ as Logos and God. In the case of woman, Cyril accepts that although Adam was created immediately by God to the Image of God, Eve was created immediately by the same God, in the image of Adam, and hence mediately to the image of God, through the Image of God, namely through Adam.¹ Consequently, Eve differs a little from Adam. This difference does not appear "in the content of the Image but simply in the mediacy of her resemblance to the Divine" and that is why Cyril finds man and woman "Images, equally images of God".²

Here we have to remember that it is only Jesus Christ Who is the unique and absolute Image of God the Father by Nature. Man was an Image by creation, by Grace.

1. I Ep. ad Corinth. 4,4. In Pusey, 3, 281. De Trinit. Dialog. 3. P.G. 75, 852.

2. Burghardt W. The Image of God in Man according to Cyril of Alexandria. Washington 1957, p.135, 137.

Chapter Three

Original State of Adam

According to Cyril, Adam's original life was incomparably superior to his life after he sinned. The Character of the divine Image in Adam through sin became dimmer and nearly destroyed.¹

We evaluate the redemptive work of Christ if we know the Corruption of Man. We understand the gravity of Adam's sin and his corruption if we compare the corrupted Adam to the Adam before his sin. Then we understand Cyril saying that Christ as the second Adam "restored" the human nature.² Cyril speaks of man's restoration to the original state.³

For these reasons we have to examine Cyril's teaching of Adam's original condition.

Adam was created by God with all attributes and presuppositions which were necessary for the fulfilment of the great End that God had put in him.

Again and again Cyril explains the biblical statement that "God created man in His Own Image and after His likeness".⁴ There is a fellowship between God and man. This would be impossible without some sort of resemblance between God and man.⁵

Now, we are trying to expose Cyril's teaching about the original condition of Adam.

Cyril insists that Adam was created. Rational: and even more "man alone, of all living creatures on earth, is rational, compassionate, with a capacity for all virtue and dominion over all creatures on earth,

1' C. Anthrop. 5. P.G. 76, 1085. "...ἦν ἅγιος ὁ πρῶτος χρόνος τῆς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ζωῆς"

2. Ibid. 8. P.G. 76, 1092.

3. In Ioan. 9, 1. Pusey 2, 481.

4. Adv. Julian, 8. P.G. 76, 925.

5. Hearing Th. Der Christliche Glauben E.T. by J. Dickie - G. Ferries. Vol. I. London 1915. p.390-391.

after the image and likeness of God". Therefore, inasmuch as he is rational, man is said to have been created in the Image of God.¹ As we see here, Cyril speaks of the divine Image as existing in the reason of Adam. In many passages Cyril asserts that it is through his mind that man is said to have been created according to the Image of God.² " ..κατ'εἰκόνα Θεοῦ ὁ ἡμέτερος ἔκτισται νοῦς.." ²

"I would regard it as characteristic of man that he recognises his own nature and is not unaware that he has been made a rational being according to the Image of his Creator."³ Cyril expresses his idea more clearly when he calls man "a rational, mortal being, capable of understanding and knowing",⁴ or "a rational mortal animal".⁵ In order to understand this point we have to remember that "Intelligence" is given to man with his existence.⁶ It is God Himself who created man with a mind capable of wisdom and able to possess the power of understanding⁷ so that there was in man, and no doubt in Adam, a natural ability for understanding and knowing.⁸ Since reason belongs to man's nature, he cannot stop being a rational being.⁹ But Cyril does not forget that Adam's Image existed not "simply in his rationality but in his rationality in relation and dependence on his participation in the divine reality. And while God is the absolute

-
1. Epist. ad. Calosyrium, in Pusey. In Ioan. 3, 605.
 2. C. Anthrop. P.G. 76, 1069.
 3. In Ioan. 3,4. Pusey 1, 439. Hom. Pasch. 5, 2. P.G. 77, 473.
 4. In Ioan. 6. Pusey 2, 129.
 5. Thesaurus 34, P.G. 75, 596.
 6. In Ioan. 1, 9. Pusey 1, 113.
 7. In Luke, Hom. 130. E.T. by Smith. 2, 603.
 8. In Ioan. 4, 5. Pusey 1, 600.
 9. In Ioan. 2, 6. " 1, 325.

Reason by nature, Adam became rational because of God.¹ Since God gave this rationality to Adam's nature itself. Cyril calls Adam rational by nature.² And since this rationality belonged to Adam's nature, it was impossible for him to become irrational. Adam was given by God rationality for the fulfilment of his end. Undoubtedly Adam's rationality was not perfect, was not like the rationality of God Himself, since Adam was a limited creature. Because of his rationality, Adam was able "of being conscious of himself and of the external world through which he could recognise the Power, the Glory and the Wisdom of the Creator".

Cyril does not find, however, the Divine Image only in the rationality of Adam. He sees it also in another attribute of the human being, in Adam's Freedom, in his free will. That is why Cyril very often speaks of Adam as "having been created free".

"Man, from the beginning, was given the reins of his own volitions - will, and had the power to move towards his own desire - for God is free, and Adam was modelled at Him. Only in this way could Adam be admired, if he was going to practise the virtue (of his own accord) in his own will, and if the purity of his actions was the fruit of his own opinions and judgement, and not of natural necessity, which would not allow him to do something else than the good, even if he wished to do otherwise. Man (Adam) therefore was equipped from the beginning with unrestricted and unimpeded movement of purpose in all his action."³

1. Burghardt op. c. p.35.

2. In Ioan. 1, 7-8. Pusey 1, 170. "Λογικός κατὰ φύσιν".

3. In Genesim. 1, 4. P.G. 69, 24.

"πεποίητο ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐν ἀρχαῖς τῶν ἰδίων θελημάτων τὰς ἡνίας πεπιστευμένος καὶ τὴν ἐφ' ᾧ περ ἂν ἔλοιτο ῥοπὴν ἀνειμένην ἔχων. Ἐλεύθερον γὰρ τὸ θεῖον πρὸς ὃ καὶ μεμόρφωτο".



In this important passage Cyril is very clear in pointing out that Adam was equipped from his creation with freedom, free Will. His free Will consisted in having the power to control his own desires, his own thoughts, and therefore to choose either good or evil, to control his own movements, his own actions, even the good. It was for that reason that Adam was to be admired and his actions were considered morally as good or bad. Without free will there is no virtue.

Cyril often calls Adam, "self-determining" and controlling his own volitions and in this self-determining Cyril sees the Image of God because "God controls His Own Volitions."¹ And that is why Cyril in other cases characterises Adam with two adjectives together, self-controlling and free.² Adam was self-controlling because he was free. In this sense, being free, Adam was able not simply to wish one thing in preference to another, but also to choose either good or evil and therefore to do so. Only in this sense can we understand Cyril when he says that man is good or evil just because he wills to be so,³ although Cyril speaks always of the necessity of divine Grace. Therefore "virtue should be only free,"⁴ and not a totalitarian thing.⁵ As good should be a free action of man, Adam had power for every virtue.⁶

I. Cyril expresses the biblical teaching when he writes that Adam was created last of the whole creation because "the earth had to be filled with those who would know how to give glory, and, from the beauty of

-
1. In Ioan. 9, 1, Pusey 2, 485.
 2. C. Julian 8, P.G. 76, 925. "αὐτοκρατής καὶ ἐλεύθερος".
 3. In Matth. 7, 11. P.G. 72, 385. In Ioan. 1, 8; Pusey, 1, 101.
 4. De Adorat. 1. P.G. 68, 145. Pasch. Hom. 15. P.G. 77, 744.
 5. P.G. 76, 744. C. Julian. 5.
 6. Resp. ad Tiberium 8. Pusey in Ioan. 3, 590. 7.

creatures .. gaze upon the glory of their Creator".¹ Although God was the Creator and the Unique Ruler of all the creation, Adam as the Image of God "was the impress of the supreme glory and the Image upon earth of divine power."²

Thus Adam was equipped with sovereignty over the creation. In the above cited passage, Cyril speaks of the Image of God as being in "Adam's dominion on the earth," since Adam from his constitution had been made by God in His Image and was to rule all creation³, He was honoured by God.

It was God who gave to Adam this gift of dominion. Therefore by his sheer nature as a human being Adam could not have any dominion upon earth. "God dignified him with dominion" and therefore the prerogative of sovereignty is neither constitutive, nor consequent upon man's nature.⁴ This idea becomes clearer when Cyril teaches that through sin, Adam lost his dominion.

On this point there is a controversial understanding among different authors and Church writers.

If we examine carefully all the passages where Cyril speaks of the Image as existing in Adam's dominion, we see that it is not the dominion itself and alone which makes Adam the Image of God but the dominion as the expression of the whole Divine Image in man, as a result of the great power of Adam's soul, of Adam's mind, which gives him the ability to rule as he likes and as he thinks best. That is why Cyril does not separate these two things, on the one hand, Adam's soul, wisdom, mind, and, on the other hand, dominion and lordship upon the earth. Adam

-
1. Glaphyra in Gen. 1. P.G. 69. 20. In Matth. 24, 29. P.G. 72,441.
 2. In Genes. 1. P.G. 69, 20.
 3. In Hebr. 2,7-8. P.G. 74,961.
 4. Burghardt, op.c. 56.

could not be Governor of the creation if he had no soul, so mind, no wisdom,¹ because he could not know how to rule. Adam was given the spirit of life² because he had to be "living" in order to be the ruler. The dead cannot rule. Therefore Adam's dominion is called the Image of God as the expression of his real divine Image.

Speaking of Adam and his original state, Cyril refers to his divine sonship which he was given by God. Adam was Son of God. There are, two kinds of Sonship. A man can be called a child of God by creation, by adoption by God, while Christ is naturally³ the Son of God. "Christ's Sonship is inseparable from His essence, it is natural⁴ and He is the Son 'par excellence'; we are sons of God in imitation of Him, by God's uncompelled favour, and participation on our part, an adoption on His.⁵ Again Cyril understands the question of Sonship, in two ways: Adam was the son of God in the sense of the Divine Sonship. We become sons of God in the sense of an adoptive sonship through Christ and because of His Incarnation and the Holy Eucharist.⁶ Is it true, however, that Adam had only the first sonship and not at all the adoptive sonship? And how then can we say that the death of Christ brought to men the restoration to Adam's original state? Cyril says that Adam as every man, could be called a "child of God" both as His creature and as being the Image of God.⁷

I do not think that Cyril speaks of restoration of an adoptive

-
1. De Incarnat. Unig. P.G. 75, 1420-21. "νοὺν ἔδωκεν ἡγεμόνα καὶ κυβερνήτην".
 2. In Isaiam 2, 8-9. P.G. 70, 81. "πνεῦμα ζωῆς".
 3. In Ioan. 1, 9. Pusey 1, 133. "ἀπαράλλακτως".
 4. Thesaurus 12. P.G. 75, 189.
 5. Thesaurus 32. P.G. 75, 540.
 6. Thesaurus 33. P.G. 75, 569.
 7. In Ioan. 7. Pusey 2, 295.

sonship of Adam, although he speaks of the adoptive Sonship through Christ.¹ This adoptive Sonship is really unique² and for that reason although the "first period of Adam's life was holy", the new life of man in Christ is far greater³. "It is in our Saviour, as the Incarnate Word, that we have obtained the Spirit as a stable gift, because Christ initially gave His immutability to our nature in His Divine person. Therefore "by the new Economy the communication of the Spirit exhibits a character of stability which human nature does not possess, in the case of Adam, because our human nature is found more intimately united to the divinity by the mystery of the Incarnation than by the fact of creation."⁴ We cannot speak of the Divine Sonship of men before they are united to God through a physical mediator who is the link between humanity and divinity.

Here we should say that when Cyril speaks of Adam as being a Son of God, he does not refer only to One of the Three Divine Persons. He does, however, refer to the Whole Holy Trinity, and in this way he understands the phrase "let us make man in our image and likeness" which for Cyril means that Adam was formed in the whole inexpressible nature of Divinity. The Holy Trinity has the fulness of the ineffable divinity, and in the Holy Trinity, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, the one, ineffable and incomprehensive nature of God is to be understood,⁵ although Cyril does not avoid telling us that we are Images of God but sons through the Son in the Spirit, in the sense that we are

1. In Isaiam 4, 1. P.G. 70, 889.

2. Burghardt op.c. p.114.

3. De Adorat. 17. P.G. 68, 1076. "πολύ μείζων"

4. In Ioan. 5, 2. Pusey 1, 693.

5. Adv. Julian. P.G. 76, 537.

sons and He is the Son as well, though unique and natural.¹ However, Cyril would not reject the idea that "we, who were to be called the sons of God, had to be made rather to the Son's image in order that the distinctive mark of His sonship might be conspicuous in us".²

Cyril is careful in using that language, because God did not create Adam in His Image but according to His Image. It is only Christ who is the natural Image of God the Father, but since man was created according to the Image of the Son, therefore, man is said to have been created according to the Image of God, since there is only one God of One Substance in three Hypostases.³

Cyril in some cases calls Adam⁴ by nature mortal and corruptible⁵ because "everything that has been created is corruptible."⁶

However, according to Cyril, Adam was created in order to be immortal and incorruptible as well. Cyril expresses this teaching in three ways: (1) when he says that "God created Man to be uncorrupted,"⁷ (2) when he says that God did not create death⁸ and (3) when he says that death and corruption came only as results of Adam's Sin,⁹ which means that before his sin Adam was not under corruption nor death.

Therefore when Cyril calls Adam mortal by nature he means something else. According to Cyril God created man relatively immortal, and thus the possibility of death - sin death came as a result of sin - existed for Adam. It was not impossible for Adam to be attacked by death. He was created in such a way that to die or to remain immortal depended

1. De Trinit. Dial. P.G. 75, 837.

2. De Dogmatum Solut. Pusey In Ioan. 3, 547.

3. In Ioan. Pusey 3, 557.

4. In Ioan. 6. Pusey 2, 128.

5. In Ioan. 4,2. Pusey 1, 531.

6. In Ioan. 8,53. P.G. 73, 928. "φθαρτόν πᾶν τό ποιηθέν".

7. Pasch. Hom. 15. P.G. 77, 744. "ἐπὶ ἀφθαρσίᾳ..ἐποίησε τόν ἄνθρωπον.."

8. In Psalm. OH'. 8. P.G. 69, 1197. "ὁ θεός θάνατον οὐκ ἐποίησεν".

9. Pasch. Hom. 15
P.G. 77, 744.

on him, on his decision to sin, or not. And to use the so called theological terms, according to Cyril, Adam had the "posse non mori" because he had the "posse non peccari". As we have seen, Adam's death and corruption were consequences of his Sin, and it was not impossible for Adam to sin.¹ Therefore if man had not sinned he could have remained in the state of his beatitude, and² remained forever steadily immortal and incorruptible, and what he had received could become his own really. In other words, according to Cyril, Adam was "relatively incorruptible" in the sense that (i) he was not created completely incorruptible but (ii) he had the power to become entirely incorruptible.

Only God is essentially incorruptible because he has immortality of Himself³, while every other creature receives Immortality from God the Creator.⁴

No doubt the human body is corruptible. But what about man's soul? Since every creature receives immortality from God, then even the Soul is not immortal by itself, but only by God who has equipped man's soul with this immortality,⁵ which afterwards belongs to this soul itself and is the characteristic of Soul for ever. That is why Cyril calls the soul immortal,⁶ without end but not without beginning.⁷ Man's Soul remained immortal even after he sinned. God had created the Soul itself, Immortal, while Adam's body became mortal after his sin.

Adam's Immortality, although it was a gift of God to him was

-
1. De Adorat. 1. P.G. 68, 145.
 2. In Ioan. 18, 1. P.G. 74, 129.
 3. De Trinit. P.G. 75, 1116." οὐκ ἔστιν "
 4. Epist. CXXII. P.G. 75, 345.
 5. Ibid.
 6. Adv. Nest. V. P.G. 76, 244.
 7. In Ioan 1, 9. Pusey 1, 138-139.

natural to Adam's soul, an essential element of his soul. Man is called mortal only because his body is mortal.

Therefore speaking of Adam's Incorruption which was lost through sin, Cyril refers to the Incorruption of Adam's body. Thus we can understand the term Corruption as physical death and bodily dissolution while Incorruption is man's victory over both,¹ or man's state before sin. However, generally speaking, corruption for Adam meant his general whole sinful and corrupted state after his sin. There is something more to say. If physical death means the separation of the body from the soul, then Incorruption is the harmonic unity of soul and body in Adam.

And not only death but also suffering, was unknown to Adam.² Also Sorrow had no place in Adam in Paradise.³ No curse was levelled at woman to give birth to children in sorrow.⁴

These are characteristics of Adam's Incorruption before his Fall. We see what Adam lost through sin. We can understand what Corruption meant for Adam.

After all these explanations we can complete the above given meaning of Incorruption of Adam, and we can say that for Adam it was the position in which his body did not know either physical death or weakness, either moral imperfection or fleshly desires.⁵ Adam's mind was not borne down by lusts that lead to sin.

The flesh of Adam was not weak as it was after corruption, Adam was not a slave to carnal passions. Therefore Incorruption for Adam was

-
1. Burghardt op. c. p.91.
 2. In Lukam homil. 153 (E.T. by Smith 2,719).
 3. In Ioannem 7, (fragmenta,) Pusey 2, 280.
 4. In Lukam hom. 2. P.G. 72, 489.
 5. Epist I ad Corinth. 7. In Pusey 3,310.

not only a simple matter of physical life but it was connected with the whole spiritual state of Adam, his holiness, his unity with God.

All his spiritual state could be considered in full connection to his Incorruption¹, since only when sin came and affected him, he lost what he had. And sin is considered as moral evil. For this reason Cyril connects Incorruption and Holiness.² Both were inseparable for Adam.

Speaking of Adam as having been created with Mind, Cyril admits that this Mind was capable of wisdom and knowledge.³ And if every man's mind, even after the corruption, is capable of knowledge, it is not difficult to understand how much more capable Adam's mind was.

Adam's knowledge was knowledge either of himself, or of the world, or of God. He knew who he was and which gifts he had been given. He knew the nature, since he was able to name all the animals. He knew that God was his Creator and his Father. Cyril speaks of Adam's knowledge in these three directions. He speaks of Adam's Theognosia (Knowledge about God) and of Adam's knowledge of every good thing which was useful to him.⁴ Adam knew God relatively by being in communion with Him or even by receiving revelations from Him.⁵ His knowledge was far greater than it was after his sin and corruption.

However, Adam's knowledge could not be absolutely perfect like God's omniscience, but only relatively, since he was a creature of God, and not God. And because his knowledge was not absolutely perfect, it could be more and more improved, according to his ripening maturity.⁶

1. C. Julian. 8. P.G. 76, 928.

2. De Trinit. Dial. 3. P.G. 75, 853.

3. In Ioan. 7, 15. P.G. 73, 656. "Δεκτικός σοφίας ὁ ἀνθρώπινος νοῦς".

4. C. Julian. 3. P.G. 76, 653. "ἐγκαταβεβλήσθαι φασὲν τῇ ἀνθρώπου φύσει τὴν / Θεογνωσίαν...".

5. C. Julian. 3. P.G. 76, 653.

6. C. Anthrop. 2. P.G. 76, 1081.

His knowledge was given to him directly and immediately by God Himself¹ with Whom he was in closest communion. His knowledge was pure and it is because God was inspiring Adam and giving him his knowledge, that Cyril has no hesitation in saying that Adam was not deprived even of a prophetic charism - gift. "We find Adam not being deprived of a prophetic spirit before sin affected him. When God created woman, He led her to him, and Adam, although he did not know who she was or how she had been created, said: this is bone of my bones: and for that, one shall leave his father and mother ..² These phrases were both a prophecy of Adam, inspired by God, and, at the same time, a command of God. This prophecy was later fulfilled.

Adam was neither like a simple infant nor a lump in the field of grass. But even if Adam is considered as 'a simple infant', even then we understand from this expression the purity, innocence and simplicity of his yet uncorrupted heart, in other words, his relative matureness.

Here we have to face a difficult problem. Cyril speaks of Adam as having such a wide knowledge. Adam in Paradise not only had knowledge of all good things,³ but also "was not deprived of the knowledge and of the distinction of good and evil".⁴ Adam knew good and evil in Paradise before his Fall, and certainly he knew both, again, after his Sin. But Cyril finds a great difference in Adam's knowledge of evil before and after his sin.

Adam, like the Angels, did not evil, but only theoretically, freely and without being under its influence and the tyranny of evil.

-
1. C. Anthropol. 2 P.G. 76, 1081
 2. C. Julian. 75. P.G. 76, 377. "Ὁὐκ ἔρημον Προφητικοῦ πνεύματος εὐρήσομεν τὸν /'Αδάμ".
 3. C. Anthropol. 2. P.G. 76, 1081.
 4. C. Julian. 3. P.G. 76, 641. "ὁὐ γεγόνασιν ἐν ἀγνοίᾳ καλοῦ τε καὶ πονηροῦ κατὰ τὸν παράδεισον οἱ πρῶτοι".

Because Adam had such a knowledge of evil Cyril in other cases says that Adam knew only good. Adam was like a doctor who, without being ill, knows the existence and nature of an illness. Adam knew evil theoretically without having personal experience, while he knew good positively and by experience. Adam was attacked and corrupted by sin and sinful desires. "He not only possessed a simple knowledge of evil, but he also experienced it, i.e. he knew it by personal experience, after he became sinful".¹

Speaking of the original condition of Adam, Cyril does not forget to speak of his moral purity and innocence in Paradise. Adam was released of every sinful desire towards sin,² from what we call now, concupiscence. Adam was created with a strong tendency and inclination towards good. His inclination was natural.³ Adam possessed rich seeds of holiness and moral integrity.⁴ This idea is to be considered in Connection with Adam's inner natural and positive Knowledge of Good. But Adam's holiness was not a perfect and absolutely complete holiness. Adam was not in such a state in which there was no possibility of evil.⁵

Undoubtedly Adam could bring himself from the state of his relative sinlessness to a state of a moral perfection in which evil would have been impossible.⁶

Adam, therefore, was not in the state of "non posse peccare" but of "posse non peccare" if we are going to use the known theological terms. Adam's sinless was "relative", not in the sense that it was impossible

-
1. Ibid."είσοδραμοῦσης δέ τῆς φθορᾶς...οὐκ ἐν ἀλλῇ τῇ γνώσει γεγόνασι τοῦ κακοῦ ἀλλὰ /καὶ διὰ πείρας αὐτῆς κεχώρηκε τὸ ἁρρώστημα".
 2. In Luke 5, 25. P.G. 72, 796.
 3. C. Anthropol. 2, P.G. 76, 1081."...πρὸς τὸ ἀγαθὸν φυσικὴν ἔχων τὴν ἐπιτηδειότητα"
 4. De Adorat. 1. P.G. 68, 145."...ἁμαρτίας καὶ παθῶν ἀνωτέρω πως τὴν διάνοιαν /ἔχων".
 5. Ibid.
 6. Ad Regin. de Rect. Fid. 26. P.G. 76, 1369."Ἀποδέδοται τῇ ἀνθρώπου φύσει τὸ ἐν Ἀδάμ ἐν ἀρχῇ,,.ὁ ἁγιασμός, τὸ δὲ περισσὸν φησὶ τὸ κατ'ἐνέργειαν ὁρᾶσθαι σεπτούς".

for him to sin, but in the sense that he had no sin nor sinful inclination in his nature,¹. We shall examine this question in detail later.

Adam's state of relative sinlessness and holiness was undoubtedly a State of Grace since the help of the Divine Grace was absolutely necessary for Adam.²

Adam could not exist without the Holy Spirit, therefore Adam's state before sin, in comparison to his state after sin, was a supernatural state which is given to man by God in Christ.

According to Cyril, Adam's original state could be considered as a natural state, as well.

Consequently, Adam's original state, according to Cyril, was at the same time both natural and supernatural, which means that Adam's state was neither only natural, nor only supernatural. It was a condition of "good" which needed progress and perfection with the help of Divine Grace.³

In conclusion, Cyril considers Adam neither morally bad, nor even morally indifferent, because moral indifference is really evil or rather moral indifference leads to evil since this indifference considers the demands of good and evil as equal, but also not absolutely good and perfect. Cyril considers Adam as "good in a relative sense".

Adam, being in such a condition, was in full harmony with nature, with himself, and with God; in harmony with nature, bound to his

1. C. Anthrop. 2, P.G. 76, 1081.

2. In Ioan. 14, 20. P.G. 74, 277. "...δυνάμει τοῦ ἐνοικισθέντος αὐτῷ διακρατούμενος

3. Trembelas. Dogmatics of the Orthodox Catholic Church. Vol.I' /Πνεύματος". Athens, 1959. p.499.

dominion without any obstacle, in harmony with himself, because his body, being released from corruption and sin, was the instrument of his spirit and soul, and in harmony with God, because He was the centre of Adam's thoughts, desires and love. Cyril's teaching of Adam's original state will help us to understand the Cyrillian hamartiology and then Soteriology.

Second Section

Adam and Sin

Although Cyril has not written any systematic work on the subject of sin, nevertheless, whenever he refers to this problem, he considers it very seriously, ^{and} connects it with all Theology and therefore with Soteriology.

The seriousness of this problem lies (i) on the gravity of sin itself and its results for Adam and the whole of mankind (ii) on the fact that it was a simple creature who sinned against God the Creator (iii) on the fact that God was not only the Creator but also the great benefactor of Adam and (iv) on the fact that the Incarnation of Logos would not have been necessary if man had not sinned.

In the following section I am dealing with Cyril's teaching about the possibility of sin in Adam, the Formal and Essential Character of Adam's sin and its essence.

Chapter OnePossibility of Sin in Adam

Here we are facing a difficult question. How did it come that Adam, in the state of his holiness, his happiness, his spiritual and intellectual clear-sightedness, his intimacy with God, could possibly sin?

General speaking, the possibility of sin in Adam can be understood in two ways: (i) either Adam had in his nature the possibility in the sense that he was bound to sin, and thus he could not do otherwise or (ii) in Adam there was this possibility of sin in the sense that (a) it was not compulsory for him to sin and (b) it was, also, not impossible for him to sin.

Cyril finds the possibility of sin in three reasons:

I'. In the existence of the external temptation by the Devil. It was not Adam who first invented sin, nor did sin belong to Adam's nature for in that case sin could not be punished,¹ nor even did Adam's sin consist in any act of rebellion of sinful desire because such a desire had no place in Adam before his sin. That is why Cyril calls sin ἐπεισυχτος.²

Before man sinned and fell there was Satan,³ the inventor and the father of sin.⁴ There was the origin of sin⁵, the founder of transgression,⁶ who first brought sin into the world.⁷ He was the external tempter of Adam and he had power of leading man to evil.⁸

-
- | | | |
|----|------------------|--|
| 1. | In Psalm. 50, 7. | P.G. 69, 1089. "Ὁ φυσικὴ ἢ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἐνέργεια " |
| 2. | Pasch. Hom. 6. | P.G. 77, 512. |
| 3. | In Genes. | P.G. 69, 20. |
| 4. | De Adorat. 1. | P.G. 68, 148. "ἁμαρτίας εὐρετής καὶ πατήρ " |
| 5. | In Genes. | P.G. 69, 24. " ἀρχέκακος". |
| 6. | In Isaian. 9, 4. | P.G. 70, 249. |
| 7. | De Adorat. 1. | P.G. 68, 152. "ὁ πρῶτος αὐτὴν εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐνεγκών " |
| 8. | In Ioan. 13, 29. | P.G. 74, 149. |

There is no doubt that Satan was also created by God as one of His good angels¹. And he with all the other evil powers together with the holy rational creatures were filling the heavenly mansions, being distinguished in glory, being far higher than us and having a higher superiority.² And Satan because of overweening pride³ and his envy, of which he was the inventor⁴, of man's beatitude, did not stop tempting man.⁵

It was this Satan who used guile and deceit, of which he was again the originator,⁶ in order to lead Adam astray from God.⁷ "This Satan, having become tyrant over us by means of a deceit, feared that human nature being free would revert to its former conditions. For he knew that man was always being urged by the reproofs of conscience to return to the better way, and that he hated sin as something adventitious, and that he was unhappy in wrong-doing, even though little pleasure could deduce him to it. But in order that he might not use his powers of self-control and be led by his tendency towards freedom to make an end of the pleasure which had become his tyrant.... he (the Demon) devised another means of deceit which he used as an instrument of his villainy, he suppressed the greater part of man's sorrows for sin, always suing deceit in his flight against the pricks of conscience. He told them (Adam and Eve), "You are not yourselves responsible for not being able to follow the better way nor has God placed temperance within your power; he has laid upon you a yoke of necessity; fate and nature are

-
1. In Genes. 1, 3. P.G. 69, 21.
 2. In Genes. 3. P.G. 69, 24.
 3. In Genes, 1, 8. P.G. 69, 24. "ἐξ ὑπεροφίας".
 4. De Adorat. 1. P.G. 68, 148.
 5. In Ioan. 1, 9. P.G. 73, 145.
 6. Pasch. Hom. 6. P.G. 77, 513.
 7. In Isaian 25, 10. P.G. 70, 568.

your masters, and you cannot but do their will. By such deceits the Devil enslaved man and leading him astray from the truth, made more ready for sin."¹

And, because of this guile, man was led unwisely to what he ought not to have done². Man was led to disobedience,³ to transgression,⁴ to sin⁵ against God. He presented the forbidden tree as eatable and Adam fell.⁶

Therefore, before man sinned and fell, there was the inventor of sin, the tempter of Adam, the external temptation. Certainly this external temptation and Adam's sin must be neither confused nor identified. Adam's temptation by the Devil was not Adam's personal sin. We understand the possibility of sin in Adam in the sense that for Adam there was this external danger. Sin was adventitious, accidental, and did not belong to Adam's nature.

II'. Cyril sees the possibility of sin within Adam. This reason could be considered as intrinsic. Man was created according to the Image of God and after His Likeness".⁷ His mind was superior to sin and passions⁸ since the power of sin was not natural.⁹

Cyril, however, points out that Adam was not unchangeable and therefore there was on the one hand the possibility of remaining in the state of his ancient nature and if he had not sinned nor disobeyed,¹⁰

-
1. Pasch. Hom. 6. P.G. 77, 512.
 2. In Genes. 1. P.G. 69, 24. " ἐφ' ᾧ μὴ προσῆκε ".
 3. De Adorat. 1. P.G. 68, 148. " πρὸς παρακοήν ".
 4. In Genes. 1. P.G. 69, 21. " πρὸς παράβασιν "
 5. Ibid. " πρὸς ἁμαρτίαν ".
 6. In Genes. 1. P.G. 69, 24.
 7. De Incarn. Unig. A.6. P.G. 75, 1013.
 8. De Adorat. 1. P.G. 68, 145.
 9. In Psalm. 50, 7. P.G. 69, 1089.
 10. In Ioan. 13, 18. P.G. 74, 129.

but on the otherhand the possibility of changing was not ruled out for him since Adam was able to do what he preferred.¹

Since Adam was not incapable of changing and since this change cannot be understood except in terms of sin, the possibility of sin existed for Adam. Adam was not unchangeable because he, as a creature, was not infinite. Only God is infinite and therefore unchangeable.

In his work against Julian,² Cyril expresses this idea more clearly. God created man, and his nature was not unchangeable. Man should not have been unchangeable because this would have destroyed the idea of any freedom in choosing that for which man had to be either rewarded or punished. Man had to be personally responsible, and innate virtue is not real virtue and it cannot be rewarded.

Speaking of man as being changeable, Cyril says that even man's soul is changeable,³ since, as we have seen man's soul was created by God but not of the same substance as God's own. Only God is unchangeable. Man's soul is a creature. Only God is unchangeable since only the Divine nature and substance is not "γεννητή"⁴. If Adam were unchangeable then either he would not simply be a creature, since only God is by nature unchangeable, or God would be simply One similar to His creatures. Then He could not be called Creator, since He would have the same nature as His creatures, and would be one of His creatures. The creatures cannot be but creatures only. Their creation would be their first real change "from not being into being".

-
1. De Adorat. 1. P.G. 68, 145." οὐκ ἀνεπίδεκτος τῆς ἐφ' ὅπερ ἂν ἔλοιτο παρατροπῆς"
 2. C. Julian. 3. P.G. 76, 617.
 3. De Adorat. 1. P.G. 68, 148." τρεπτή".
 4. C. Anthropom. I. P.G. 76, 1096." οὐκ ἀνέχεται τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ὅτι μὴ φύσεως ἐστὶ....γεννητῆς, οὐκ ἐχούσης τὸ ἀτρεπτον καὶ τὸ εἰς ἅπαν διαδιδράσκειν δύνασθαι τὴν ἁμαρτίαν".

This subject should be further examined. Cyril presents another important point in his work against Anthropomorphitas:¹

In this work Cyril says:

Adam was created holy with aptitude towards good.

This holiness was given at the beginning to the nature of man and as natural this could not be either punished or rewarded.² Adam had by nature this aptitude towards good because God Himself had put it to Adam's nature.³ This holiness was given to Adam as an aptitude and power but not as an complete activity. Adam was not given a complete holiness. " Πᾶσα μὲν ἐπιτηδειότης ...οὐ πάντως δέ καί ἐνέργεια ".

The perfection of Adam in holiness ought to be considered as his activity. Adam had to realise this activity by improving and perfecting his power, his aptitude, his Holiness, through his personal efforts; undoubtedly not without Divine Grace.

Cyril does not speak of Adam in terms of absolute moral perfection and complete holiness. It must be repeated here that this imperfection in itself, however, was not Adam's guilt nor his sin. Imperfection and sin must be neither confused nor identified. Finally, since Adam was not perfect, as we have seen, the possibility of sin for him existed. Only for God there is no possibility of sin because God alone is by His Nature beyond any imperfection. Nor can we speak of any guilt in God for Adam's having sinned. God did not like Adam to sin and to fall.⁴ Adam himself decided and sinned.⁵ Had man been created perfect, then his holiness could not have been of any moral value.

1. C. Anthrop. P.G. 76, 1096.

2. In Psalm. 58, 7. P.G. 69, 1089.

3. C. Anthrop. II'. P.G. 76, 1081. "παντός ἀγαθοῦ...ἐφεσιν...ἐγκατεβάλετο φυσικῶς".

4. In Genes. 1. P.G. 69, 25.

5. " " " " " " " " "ὁ δὲ ἡρρώστησε τὸ ποθεῖν ".

The imperfection of Adam was not guilt for him.

God willed to create men with the possibility of making themselves perfect and worthy of reward, undoubtedly not without God's Grace. Innate holiness and awarded virtue should not be confused.

III'. Cyril speaks of the possibility of sin in Adam also when he examines the great problem of Adam's freedom. God is a free Being.¹

Cyril can easily form a syllogism. God is free, and since man was created according to the Image of God, then Man is a free being as well. Cyril expresses this idea when he says that: God is free and Man has been modelled to Him.²

There is a great difference between God's freedom which is absolute and man's freedom which can only be relative, since it is the freedom of a finite creature.

Freedom cannot be understood apart from the idea of self-controlling. God is the absolutely free Being, controlling His own Will.³ Man as the image of God was relatively self-controlling of himself and of his own will.⁴

If Adam were not a free being, he might have been holy, even perfect, but he could not be called an 'Image of the free God'. Cyril does not separate the two ideas; freedom and self-controlling.⁵

Here Cyril considers Adam's freedom internally and externally, as well. In other words, Adam could freely express and do whatever he had freely thought and willed. He had the power and possibility of controlling himself, his thoughts, his desires, his actions. He had

1. In Genes. 1. P.G. 69, 24. "Ἐλεῦθερον τὸ Θεῖον"

2. Ibid.

3. In Ioan. 14, 20. P.G. 74, 277. "κατεξουσιάζει τῶν οἰκείων θελημάτων".

4. Ibid.

5. C. Julian. 8. P.G. 76, 995. "αὐτοκρατής καὶ ἐλεῦθερος".

this possibility because he was free to do so. Only free beings can control themselves. If Adam had not been free, then he could not control himself. But Cyril speaks of Adam as being able to control himself. Again, if Adam could not control himself, then he could not be free nor as we have seen 'the image of God'. But in Cyril's teaching Adam is considered as having been created free as an Image of the free God.

While Cyril connects so closely Freedom and self-controlling, he separates self-controlling from necessity. Being self-controlling man is not kept by necessity.¹

Depending on man's freedom, self-controlling belongs to man's nature. Necessity comes from outside as an external factor, the doing of something most opposed to man's will.

Adam could control himself not by an external necessity but by his will. If he could control himself and his actions, he could harmonise them or not to the free Will of God.² Adam had in his power the possibility of choosing either good or evil because he was the master of both.²

Here Cyril distinguishes clearly between sin and the possibility of sin in Adam. Adam had this possibility of choosing and doing either good or evil, and moreover he was master of his inclination in either.

It was God who gave to Adam the power to act as he preferred³ because God willed that virtue should be free in man and not of necessity.⁴ Virtue and necessity are two irreconcilable things.

1. In Psalm L. P.G. 69, 1089. "οὐκ ἀνάγκη κρατεῖσθαι τό αὐτεξούσιον".

2. In Ioan. Pusey 2, 123.

3. Pasch. Hom. 15. P.G. 77, 744. "Δρᾶν ἐπ' ἐξουσίας, ὅπερ ἂν ἔλοιτο".

4. De Adorat. I'. P.G. 68, 145. "προαιρετικὴν ἐν ἡμῖν ὀρᾶσθαι τὴν ἀρετὴν καὶ οὐχ ὥσπερ τῆς ἀνάγκης ἀλλ' οὐδέ φύσεως νόμοις ἀδιαπτῶτως ἐρηρυσμένην".

Virtue by necessity is not real virtue. We cannot speak of virtue unless it comes from a free will.

The tree of virtue grown only in the fertile field of freedom, and this freedom was for Adam the real area within which he was called to fight in order to show that he wanted and was worthy of participating in God's beatitude.

If Adam was able to act virtuously, freely, it was also possible for him not to do so, not to do good, therefore to do evil, to sin; otherwise he could not be free.

According to Cyril, the possibility of preferring and doing evil for Adam was not ruled out, but still existed.

Therefore, either Adam was given freedom and he was capable of doing what he willed, or he could not do so and then he was not free. But if Adam were not free, then he could not have been punished for his sin since he would not have sinned willingly.¹ Punishment is always related to a free action, because only in this case can we speak of personal responsibility. There is no punishment without personal responsibility and guilt. And there is no guilt without personal free Will.

Without freedom even the moral actions of Adam could have no moral value.

Because there was for Adam the possibility of sin, that is why sin has been a reality, that is why Adam went to the opposite² willingly, and that is why, therefore, Adam himself preferred the punishment and all consequences³ although he could remain in the good state of his

1. De Adorat. 15. P.G. 68, 977.

2. De Adorat. 6. P.G. 68, 453.

3. In Isaiam. 5, 25. P.G. 70, 160. "εἴλετο μᾶλλον τὰς ἐκ τοῦ κολάζεσθαι πικρίας καὶ τοῖς οὕτω δεινοῖς ἐκτρέχεσθαι κακοῖς".

ancient nature if he had not sinned and disobeyed and transgressed the Command.¹

I have to close this chapter now with a general remark. Cyril sees the possibility of sin in Adam in the sense that Adam was not bound to sin, since God did not force him to sin nor did sin belong to his nature. Adam who was created relatively sinless had to become positively perfect. But to achieve this perfection, Adam had to be extremely careful because the danger, the possibility of sin existed.

God willed to test Adam's use of his freedom. Being in a state of probation he succumbed to temptation.

Although Cyril does teach that real freedom is obedience to God, he does say, however, as we have seen, that Adam was free to disobey God's Will, and he did so.

1. In Ioan. 13, 18. P.G. 74, 129.

" Διέμεινεν ἄν ἐν τοῖς ἀρχαίοις τῆς φύσεως ἀγαθοῖς εἰ μὴ ἐτέτραπτο πρὸς ἀποστασίαν καὶ παραπνοήν ἀβουλότατα παρελθὼν τὴν διορισθεῖσαν ἐντολήν ἄνωθεν ".

Chapter Two

Character and Relations of Adam's Sin

The Reconciliation between God and man presupposes inevitably the existence of a separation "owing to sin". Atonement is a real reconciliation, a real work. Therefore, we have to see sin as a reality. If sin were the obstacle for the extension of the Kingdom of God on earth, then to depreciate sin is to depreciate the greatness of the redemptive work of Christ. That is why the Christian doctrine of Salvation has to deal with the problem of sin, i.e. of the moral evil considered in its relation to the Holy God. Christian dogmatics has to deal with both the nature and the origin of sin. The Knowledge of the nature of sin is the norm for the Knowledge of its origin.¹

In order to understand the seriousness of Adam's sin, we have to examine it: on the one hand, by itself, its double character, and, on the other hand, in its relations, firstly to the Devil, who, by the means he used, led man away from God, secondly, to God against Whom man sinned, and thirdly to Adam himself who committed this sin.

Adam's Sin by itself: Its Formal and Material Character.

Formal Character of Adam's Sin

By the formal character of Adam's sin, we mean the external form of the realisation of Adam's decision to sin. Cyril sees this external form in the fact that Adam made the forbidden fruit eatable.²

But the action of Adam cannot be separated from its inward cause, in other words, from Adam's decision to do so. That is why, speaking

1. Hearing. op. c. p.451.

2. In Genes. I'. 3. P.G. 69, 21." τὸ ἀπόρρητον τῶν ξύλων ἐδώδιμον ἐποίησαντο".

of Adam's sin, we cannot speak only of this external act of "eating of the forbidden fruit". This action was the external result of an inward cause. It was a real act of Adam.

THE MATERIAL CHARACTER OF ADAM'S SIN.

In order to characterise Adam's sin, Cyril uses different words and terms because Adam's sin can be regarded under different aspects. It may be regarded either as "a missing of man's true end" and then it is ἁμαρτία or an "inattentive hearing to God", and then it is Παρακοή or as a "transgressing of the Lord's Law", and then it is Παράβασις or as an "action contrary to the Law of God", and then it is Ἄνομία or, finally, as a "negative omission of good" and then it is Παράπτωμα .

Cyril uses all these terms. We shall try to examine each one, separately, but, as we shall see, the Cyrillian meaning of sin consists in the putting together of all these different notions.

(a) ἁμαρτία: Cyril uses this term very often.¹ The etymology of this word is not certain. Suidas derives it from the verb μάρπτω and ἁμαρτία means failing to grasp. According to Buttman, the word derives from the verb μέρομαι, which comes from the root μέρος . From that a negative intransitive verb ἁμαρτάνειν was formed. Therefore ἁμαρτάνειν means to be without a share in, to miss, to fail. Then ἁμαρτία is regarded as failing and missing the true goal of man's

1. In Ionam Prophet. A'1. P.G. 71, 604.
 In Genes. I'. P.G. 69, 24.
 In Ioan. 1, 1-2. P.G. 71, 601.

being and life,¹ and it implies, in Adam's case, his failure in trying to reach and obtain what he sought. The term ἁμαρτία is used in the case of Adam's sin to indicate both the act of sinning and the sin itself which was committed, while ἁμάρτημα (because of the ending μα) shows only the outcome and action of sin. Here Cyril presents a negative aspect of Adam's sin, the aspect of failing and missing.

(b) Παρακοή² (disobedience). In its very strictest sense it means not only failing to hear, but also an inattentive hearing. Apparently the word contains the notion of an active disobedience. In Adam's case the word is used to indicate the idea of failing to listen to God and, is inseparably connected with the idea of refusing to hear and to obey God.³

The idea of disobedience presupposes the person who disobeys, the law which is transgressed, and the Person whom man disobeys. In Adam's case it is God who gave the Command, it is Adam who disobeys God and it is the Divine Law in relation to which man disobeys God. Here we can speak of a real refusal of Adam to obey God, and to conform his will to God's Will. Hence the seriousness of Adam's disobedience was great. Finally, we can say that this disobedience subjectively shows Adam's own will and decision to sin; Objectively, it shows the fact which took place in the relations between God and man, the fact of disobedience. Here Cyril presents the positive aspect of Adam's sin, a conscious action of disobedience to God.

-
1. Buttman: Lexilogos. London 1846. p.85.
also Grimm: Greek-English Lexicon of the N.T.³ Edinburgh 1893.
p.30.
 2. De Adorat. 1. P.G. 68, 148.
 3. Trench. The Synonyms of the N.T.

(c) Παράβασις¹: The word means transgressing or overpassing an aim or line and indicates the transgressor, the law-giver, and the existence of a Law. We cannot speak of transgression unless there is something to transgress. Before Adam's Fall there was the Divine Law, thus, we can speak of the transgression of that Divine Law by Adam.

This Transgression is more serious than sin (Rom. II. 23) because the transgression is a real "Υβρις against God and His Holy Will and Adam's sin was a real "Υβρις against God, a real despicable περιφρόνησις and a great ingratitude against the great Benefactor, God as well.

(d) Παράπτωμα:² There is a distinction between ἁμαρτία and παράπτωμα

Παράπτωμα is the negative omission of good, while ἁμαρτία is the positive doing of evil.

(e) 'Ανομία³ or 'Ανόμημα This word means iniquity, transgression of a Law. Although the adjective ἄνομος is used negatively for a person without Law, the word ἄνομία is never the condition of one living without Law, but always the condition of one who acts contrary to or against the Law. In this sense Cyril uses the word ἄνόμημα.

If there is no Law, there can be no ἄνομία . In the case of Adam ἄνομία is his lack of conformity to the Divine Law.

After all that we have said, we can perceive Cyril's understanding of the character of sin in the unity of all the characteristics of the five terms through which sin can be expressed. Sin is a free and wilful disobedience and transgression of the Divine Law. Sin is an

1. Thesaurus 35. P.G. 75, 280. In Genes. 1. P.G. 69 21-24.

2. In Rom. 5, 20. P.G. 74, 972.

3. In Psalm. 50 (51), 1. P.G. 69, 1088.

"Υβρις against God. Further, sin is a moral evil. Generally speaking, evil can be regarded as privation and deficiency in perfection. Adam's sin cannot be a simple physical evil as privation from physical good, since this was the result of his sin, nor merely metaphysical, but it is a moral evil. This moral evil is to be found only in rational human beings. It deprives them of moral good. Adam's sin, his moral evil, is regarded as lack of conformity of his will to God's Will, since the morality of a human action consists in its agreement or not with the eternal moral Law.

I could say that Cyril considers Adam's sin both negatively as a sin of omission, i.e. failure and refusal to do his duty or what he ought to do and positively as a sin of commission, i.e. as a positive act of evil, contrary to the Divine Command.

Since Adam's duty was to love God, then his sin as a sin both of Commission and of omission cannot be understood but only in terms and in sense of Selfishness. The word Selfishness frequently means the lack of Love. But it also denotes quite generally the essence of all sin in point of form, thinking of oneself, Self-Love, self-seeking, Self-will, without which indeed we could not think of an opposition to the Will of God at all.¹ Cyril finds even the cause and essence of Satan's Sin and Fall in his egoism, selfishness.² Adam's sin was his preference to put himself as the supreme end and goal of his being. If love to God is the essence of man's virtue and holiness, the opposite love, love of himself, his selfishness, is the essence of his sin.³

1. Hearing Th. op. c. p. I' 424.

2. In Genes. 1, 3. P.G. 69, 24.

3. Strong. Dogmatics. Vol. II. 567.

Therefore Adam's sin is neither a weakness of will nor a negative thing, an absence of love to God, but a positive choosing and putting himself instead of God as the supreme end of his being. It was self-will instead of submission to God's Will, it was an opposition of Adam's will to God's Will. And when, speaking of sin as an opposition of Adam's Will to God's Will, we place the emphasis upon the Will of God, the Content of the Sinful volition comes manifestly before us; when we place it upon the opposition of the Will we learn the form of the sinful volitions in the most manifold relations.¹

I.

ADAM'S SIN IN ITS RELATION TO THE DEVIL, TO GOD, AND TO ADAM.

Sin and the Devil.

In order to lead Adam away from God, the Devil used satanic means,² most wicked and felon,³ which can be considered firstly as guile to deceive man and secondly as a slander against God⁴.

1) The Devil used satanic guile to seduce and deceive the simple and good mind⁵ of our first parents in order that their mind might become possible to sin.⁶ We cannot be sure whether the Devil would have succeeded or not in testing and leading Adam away from God, if he had tried to tell him the truth. What the devil said to Adam was a terrible lie. For this way of acting the Devil is called πονηρός⁷.

The Devil was able to hide his real purpose; he tested Adam,

1. Hearing. op. c. p.423.

2. In Rom. 5, 12. P.G. 74, 784.

3. In Ioan. 1, 1-2. P.G. 71, 601. " τοῖς διαβόλου κακουργήμασι ".

4. In Ioan. 13, 29. P.G. 74, 149.

5. C. Julian. 3. P.G. 76, 640.

6. In Rom. 5, 12. P.G. 74, 784. " βατή ".

7. In Psalm. 36, 8. P.G. 69, 929.

undoubtedly not without the permission of God. Man had not omniscience and therefore he could not know all the secrets of the spirits.

2) But these satanic means can also be regarded as a slander and defamation of God¹. He told the "first parents" that God had told them lies and had prevented them from eating because of envy, since He knew that, after eating, they would be able to become gods.² That is why he has been called διάβολος³. As a spirit the devil had great but not absolute power. In characterising the devil's means as "crimes"⁴ Cyril shows, at the same time, that the Devil's purpose in deceiving Adam was to make man transgressor of the Divine Command⁵ by leading him to evil⁶ and so by taking him away from God.⁷ Thus he became man's tyrant by deceit⁸. And while to love and obey God was for Adam "saving"⁹, to "disobey God is on the contrary really worst"¹⁰ and horrible¹¹. This disobedience to God took man away from God's Love¹² which was the source of all beatitude and blessedness of man.

The devil, the founder of death, is pleased with man's death, misery and sufferings¹³.

-
1. C. Julian, 3. P.G. 76, 640.
 2. Ibid. " διαβέβληκε καὶ αὐτὴν τὴν ἀνωπάτω καὶ ἀπόρρητον φύσιν ".
 3. Ibid. also in Ioan. 1. 1-2. P.G. 71, 601.
 4. In Ioan. 1, 1-2. P.G. 71, 601.
 5. Pasch. Hom. 7. P.G. 77, 512.
 6. In Isaian. 3, 11. P.G. 70, 112.
 7. In Isaian 25, 10. P.G. 70, 568.
 8. Pasch. Hom. 6. P.G. 77, 512. " τύραννος ἐξ ἀπάτης ".
 9. In Psalm. 30, 8. P.G. 69, 873. " σωτήριον ".
 10. C. Julian. 8. P.G. 76, 98 - In Isaian 9, 9. P.G. 70, 261.
 11. In Isaian 30, 6. P.G. 70, 672.
 12. In Isaian 10, 11. P.G. 75, 285.
 13. In Osee proph. 13, 3. P.G. 71, 301.

At the same time, the devil's purpose, because of egoism, was slanderous against God and therefore bad, wicked and sinful.

Sin and God

God had imposed His Command upon Adam, and the relations between God and Adam were, or rather, ought to have been and remained relations between Creator and Creature, Lord and servant, Father and Son.

It was, however, this God against whom Adam sinned, it was the Lord's Command which man broke and transgressed¹ and it was the Supreme Authority which Adam insulted.

Here we can see Adam's sin in two aspects. Being committed by a man, by a finite creature, sin is something finite, too. The same sin, however, as being committed against the Perfect God and Lord, is of infinite seriousness.

Sin and Adam

We see the seriousness of Adam's sin, if we take into consideration the responsibility and guilt of Adam in committing this sin.

Adam's guilt was great because he transgressed the Divine Law knowingly,² consciously, since he was a rational, living being.³ Only irrational beings are never responsible, never guilty.

1. In Genesim I. P.G. 69, 24.

2. In Rom. 5, 18. P.G. 74, 788.

3. In Ioan. 1, 32-33. P.G. 73, 205.

" κίπται πρὸς τὴν ἐσχάτην ἀλογίαν ὁ λογικός ".

Without free, personal will there cannot be either guilt or reward.¹

There is a great difference between to sin by ignorance and to sin while man knows what he is doing.²

Adam and Eve were conscious of their action as a transgression and especially transgression of the Divine Law. That is why they tried to justify themselves to God just after their disobedience. The Divine Law was not unknown to them.³ They accepted the temptation after a long discussion with the Serpent, therefore they were conscious of what was happening. They sinned not only knowingly but also willingly since they had the possibility either to sin or not, and this was dependent upon the use of their freedom and free will, which God had given to them.

Cyril clearly speaks of Adam's sin as being committed freely, even when he uses passive voice-verb for the Fall of Adam: Adam was led to sin by the devil⁴. In these cases Cyril, I think, speaks only of the fact of Adam's Fall and not of its causes.

The Divine Law was not too difficult,⁵ though Adam ought to have obeyed even if it had been difficult, since God was Adam's Creator and the source of happiness.⁶ God was Adam's Benefactor⁷.

That is why, according to Cyril, Adam proved himself to be ungrateful and scorner of his Benefactor and his Creator.⁸

-
1. De Adorat. 15. P.G. 68, 977 "τοῖς ἀβουλήτως συμβαίνουσιν, οὐ κατὰ δόξαιεν ἐπιτι-
/μῶν ὁ Νόμος".
 2. In Psalm. 36, 8. P.G. 69, 929. "τοῦ κατ' ἄγνοιαν κακοποιεῖν καὶ αὐτό τοῦτο θέλειν"
 3. C. Julian. 3, P.G. 76, 628.
 4. In Ioan. 1, 1-2. P.G. 71, 601.
 5. In Matth. 11, 30. P.G. 72, 405. "ἐλαφρὸς ἐστὶν ὁ ζυγὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ".
 6. In Psalm. 32, 8. P.G. 69, 873.
 7. In Ioan 1, 32-3. P.G. 73, 205.
 8. In Genes. 1, 4. P.G. 69, 24.
In Ioan. 1, 32-3. P.G. 73, 205.

Chapter Three.

Essence of Adam's Sin

In trying to present Cyril's Hamartiology, we have to examine carefully the essence of Adam's sin. It has to be said that Cyril expresses the biblical teaching when he says that "Adam in Paradise was enjoying all beatitude and all glory with God".¹

Moreover, Adam could have lived for ever in his beatitude and unity with God if he had not transgressed the Divine Law.²

But when Adam transgressed the Divine Commandment and offended God, then he had to face the Divine Wrath.³

It is terrible for men to strike against God because of selfishness and pride and egoism.⁴

Adam's immediate punishment was to be thrown out of Paradise.⁵ Living out of Paradise Adam remembered what he had lost and this memory of the "lost Paradise" was the cause of his unhappiness.⁶

Human nature changed and became corrupted.⁷ We shall examine this teaching in detail. Cyril points out that it was through and because of sin that Corruption came to Adam and to the whole of human-kind.⁸

Corruption therefore did not exist before sin, nor would Adam have been corrupted, had he not sinned. Since, as we have seen, Adam was guilty and responsible for his sin, so was he responsible for his

-
1. In Rom. 13, 18. P.G. 75, 129. "Ἐν Παραδείσῳ...καὶ δόξῃ τῇ παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ".
 2. Ibid.
 3. In Ioan. 5, 18. P.G. 74, 788. "ὑπομεμένηκε τὰ ἐκ τῆς Θείας ὀργῆς".
 4. In Isaian 30, 6. P.G. 70, 672.
also In Isaian 21, 5. P.G. 70, 488.
 5. De Adorat. 1. P.G. 68, 149. "Ἐξεπέμπετο τοῦ Παραδείσου τῆς τρυφῆς".
 6. Homil. Div. 10. P.G. 77, 1021.
 7. Ibid.
 8. In Ioan. 1, 1-2 P.G. 70, 564. "παραβάσεως δίκην ἐδέχετο τὴν φθοράν".
also In Genes. 1, 5. P.G. 69, 29.

Corruption.

Adam's sin, in its essence, is to be considered and examined under two aspects: (a) as having created a permanent sinful state and (b) as being a guilt, as well.

Sin is both a sinful state of corruption and also guilt. That is why Christian Salvation is not only salvation from corruption and death, because in that case salvation could not come before death, but it is also salvation from guilt.

Adam's Sin as a Sinful state of Corruption

By 'sinful state of Adam' we mean the permanent state of sin and Corruption in Adam after he sinned, the state of deprivation of the first Divine Grace which sanctified him, the state in which the sinful desire the Concupiscentia rushed into him, the state in which man was under the power, the control and the Law of sin.¹

(a) Corruption and Adam's Freedom.

There is no doubt that Adam's freedom, according to Cyril, did not remain after his sin, the same as it was before, Adam's nature became corrupted through sin.² His freedom was affected by the influence of sin. There is a deep inner relation between all the elements in man.

If freedom is the power to bend in either direction, towards good or its opposite, then Adam's freedom, though weakened and impaired through his sin, was not completely lost. Even now we have the power and freedom to turn towards and choose either good or evil.³

1. In Psalm. 6, 3. P.G. 69, 749. "ὁ τῆς ἁμαρτίας εἰσέδου νόμος".

2. In Ioan. 1, 1-2. P.G. 71, 601.

3. De Adorat. 6. P.G. 68, 453. "ἐφ' ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς ἐστὶ τὸ ἐπ' ἄμφω βλέπειν πρὸς τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ πρὸς τὸ ἐναντίον".

If Adam's freedom had been lost, then the power of choosing would have not existed in man. Since, however, man can choose either good or evil, as Cyril says, his freedom still remains as one of the spiritual elements of his nature, though most impaired and most weakened.

Cyril insists that we all - not only Adam - still have the power of intention, of willing, of choosing.¹ It should be noted that in all these and many other instances, speaking of man's freedom, Cyril uses the present tense of the verbs "has"² and "goes".³ Also, in very many cases, Cyril uses the plural to indicate the universal application of his teaching and stresses the fact that freedom is characteristic of man today and applies not only in the case of Adam.⁴ At this point Cyril clearly states that man is personally responsible for his choice of evil because he is not bound to do so, but it is voluntary for men to go here or there to virtue or to evil,⁵ and all men are self-governing to do what they think and like.⁶ Even people who have been badly educated can turn their minds and will towards good.⁷ Certainly, this could not be possible if man were not free to do so. It is God who has given Freedom and Self-Controlling to every one, to all people, because it is God who desires that every good action should be free in order to be rewarded.⁸ Otherwise we would not be either rewarded for good or punished for evil. That is why Cyril insists that every man should be free to choose good or evil.⁹ And this happens to all.

-
1. De Adorat. 6. P.G. 68, 453
 2. In Ioan. 6, 2.
 3. In Ioan. 6, 7. P.G. 73, 632. "αὐθαίρετον τό ἐπ' ἅμφω βαδίζειν".
 4. C. Julian 8. P.G. 76, 937.
 5. In Ioan. 6, 7. P.G. 73, 632.
 6. C. Julian. 4. P.G. 76, 716. "αὐτόνομος καὶ ἀφειμένη πρὸς τό δοκοῦν ἡ / παντός ἀνθρώπου διάνοια".
 7. Ibid.
 8. C. Julian, 3, 79. P.G. 76,
 9. Ibid. 8 P.G. 76, 937.

In all these instances Cyril does not speak only of Adam but of all people after Adam's sin. Freedom does still exist in all men though, as we have seen, most weakened, most impaired, not as it was before Adam sinned. However Cyril sometimes considers the power of man's freedom to be great.¹

No doubt, however, this power of man's freedom is only relatively great. Man is under an extremely difficult position.² This happens because man's nature is not now as it was before sin; his nature is corrupted. This power of general corruption, has inevitably a strong and apparent influence upon man's freedom.

However, man wills to do good.³

(b) Corruption and Adam's rationality.

Cyril has no doubt that Adam's rationality was seriously and strongly affected by sin and corruption. It lost its first power and clearness, and so it became weakened, darkened and distorted, and very easily inclined to evil, to sin⁴ and to lie⁵. The rational man was led to the supreme irrationality ignoring the Creator.⁶ Man's mind forgets very easily, and very readily creates idols and false gods, when he acts only according to his simple, human mind.⁷ Undoubtedly, this human mind, affected by sin, loses its power to see God, as the human eye loses its power to see clearly if dust affects or an injury damages it.⁸ And that is why human mind is producing fruits to Satan.⁹

1. De Adorat. 16, P.G. 68, 1037. "ἔρρωται πως ὁ νοῦς".

2. In Rom. 7, 18. P.G. 74, 813.

3. In Rom. 7, 18. P.G. 74, 813. "παραδέχεται σιφῶς τό παραχεῖσθαι ἡμῖν τό ἀγαθόν".

4. In Rom. 5, 12. P.G. 74, 784.

5. In Isaiian 6, 5. P.G. 70, 180. "νοσεῖ τό ψεῦδος ἡ ἀνθρώπου διάνοια".

6. In Ioan. 1, 32. P.G. 73, 205.

7. I' ad Corinth. 2, 14. P.G. 74, 865.

8. In Isaiian 5, 11. P.G. 70, 149. "...οὕτω καί ἀνθρώπινος νοῦς τοῖς τῆς σαρκὸς εἰ

9. In Isaiian 5, 5. P.G. 70, 141 /καταπαχύνητο τρυφαῖς ἀναμβεῖν οὐ δύναται πρὸς / Θεόν".

However, if Cyril is right in pointing out that even after sin, man has the power of free choice, then it should therefore be accepted that man still is also relatively a rational being who is capable somehow of understanding, of knowing what he is choosing, and, mainly, of hearing, understanding and knowing God. So, although, undoubtedly, man has lost his first perfect reason Vision of God and his reason is now weak, darkened, impaired¹, nevertheless his rationality, mind, has not been entirely lost, has not completely disappeared.

Burghard says that sin did not make man either inhuman or irrational, completely.² Man still remains a human being, though wounded, who still keeps a small light burning, so that after the Fall he may be able to accept a Divine Message, when God speaks.

(c) Corruption and Adam's dominion.

Cyril reminds us that Adam was created according to the Image of the Creator and was appointed to rule over all things on the earth.³ But by sin "he was stripped of the Kingship and the glory which he had in the beginning,"⁴. Therefore, Adam lost his dominion over the whole of nature, which now does not obey him as it did before he sinned. The earth became cursed to him⁵ and gives him pains, because its inhabitants have insulted God, the Creator of the whole of nature.⁶

(d) Corruption and Adam's Divine Sonship.

Cyril teaches that Adam in his pre-fallen state was in deep and real relationship and kinship with God, the Divine Father and Creator because of the indwelling of the Divine Grace in him.⁷ But after Adam

1. In Isaian 5, 25. P.G. 70, 169.

2. c. op. p.144.

3. In Genes. I. P.G. 69, 20.

4. De Adorat. 2, P.G. 68, 244.

5. In Isaian 24, 5-6
P.G. 70, 540.

6. Ibid.

7. De Sancta Trinit.
P.G. 75, 908.

sinned, he lost his true and special relationship with God.¹

And although even after his sin, Adam could still be called the son of God by his creation,² nevertheless having lost his participation in the Holy Spirit in the full sense, he lost also his first perfect Divine Sonship, and, as Burghardt says, Adam "lost his supernatural relationship his unmerited kinship, which had been given to him through the indwelling spirit".³

(e) Corruption and Adam's Immortality.

Adam, as we have seen, was created to be immortal.⁴ But, as Cyril teaches, because of the transgression Adam became corrupted⁵ and mortal⁶ himself was responsible for that. God did not create death since He never wanted the loss of His Creatures, the loss of living beings.⁷ It is certain, therefore, that death came as the fruit of sin.⁸ Adam neglected and offended the Divine Commandment.⁹ Cyril shows the gravity of Adam's sin when he says that Adam's death came both because of the Divine Wrath and the Divine curse after the transgression of the Commandment¹⁰. Although we have to speak of man only in terms of his

-
1. In Isaian 54, 6. P.G. 70, 120.
 2. Pusey 2, 295.
 3. op. c. p.147.
 4. In Rom. 5, 18. P.G. 74, 788. also In Ioan. 1, 9. P.G. 73, 145.
 5. In Genes. 1, 5. P.G. 69, 29.
 6. In Psalm. 9, 6. P.G. 69, 760. "ἡ παράβασις εἰσήνε την φθοράν καὶ τόν θάνατον".
 7. In Leviticum P.G. 69, 540.
 8. In Psalm. 9, 6. P.G. 69, 760.
 9. In Ioan. 14, 30. P.G. 76, 209. Adv. Nestor. 5. P.G. 74, 788.
 10. Adv. Nestor. 5. P.G. 76, 209. also in Rom. 5, 18. P.G. 74, 788.

creatureness, it is however, certain that "man died not because he is creature but because he is a sinner".¹

When Cyril speaks of Adam's sin in relation to the guile used by the Devil, he sees the Devil as the cause of death, since he only wants the destruction and loss of man.² That is why Cyril calls the Devil "Death" himself.³ That is why as sin is something against God, so is also death, as result of sin "das gegenteil Gottes" whose the substance is life.⁴

Finally, when Cyril speaks of death, he means both physical death, i.e. the separation of the body from the soul, and spiritual death, the separation of the Soul from God.⁵ If God is the true life, and if real life means only a life in God, then the separation from this life, from God, is a real, spiritual death. This separation can be either here on earth or endless in the world of eternity. When Cyril speaks of death as a result of Adam's sin, he insists that Adam became the archetype of being under Corruption and death as Christ is the prototype "of not being under death".⁶ Adam got subjected to Corruption, i.e. to sufferings, pain and every bad thing; he did not remain in his painless and sorrowless life; so he fell to the state of sorrow.⁷ Pain, sorrow sweat, distress, sufferings, and lastly but mainly death as the fruits of Adam's sin started when Adam neglected his painless life in Paradise, and as Schlink says "der Tod wirst also den Menschen in die Nichtigkeit,

1. Ed. Schlink. Der Mensch in der Verkündigung der Kirche. München 1936. p.178.

2. In Osee 13, 3. P.G. 71, 301. "ταῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἡδεταί σφαγαῖς".

3. In Psalm. 15, 4. P.G. 69, 809. "Αὐτός ἦν ὁ θάνατος".

4. Schlink. op. c. p.177.

5. Homil. 14. P.G. 77, 1088. "θάνατος κυρίως ...ὁ χωρίζων ψυχὴν ἀπὸ Θεοῦ".

6. In Ioan. 3. P.G. 76, 128.

7. De Incarn. Unig. P.G. 75, 1424. "ἰδρῶτι καὶ πόνῳ καὶ ταλαιπωρίᾳ συγκληρωθεῖς, καὶ οἷον τι χαλινῷ τῇ γηπονίᾳ καὶ κακοπαθείᾳ καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις τοῦ βίου πονηρίαις". παραδοθείς".

aber nicht in ein absolutes Nichts".¹

(f) Corruption and Adam's holiness.

Adam in Paradise was holy both ontologically by participation in God's nature through the Holy Spirit and dynamically by his conscious imitation of God through his virtuous living.²

"The primitive period of human life in Adam .. was holy".³
The Creator implanted (in Adam) like some seal of His own nature, the Holy Spirit, through whom he was fashioned to the archetyped beauty and use perfected after the Image of the Creator.⁴

Adam was created in the Image of the Creator and he was in communion with God through his life of holiness. But when he was tricked by the bitter guile of Satan .. he was removed from his original state ... he slipped from the hand which held him in holiness and fell down to earth from the state of virtue.⁵

Cyril insists that Adam was sanctified because he was partaker of the Holy Spirit, but he cast Him away through sin⁶ and when the Holy Spirit fled from him, then he fell down from the heights of virtue.⁷

Burghardt is right in this case in saying that, according to Cyril Adam lost both his ontological and dynamic holiness,⁸ if by Adam's ontological holiness he means man's participation in the nature of God by the Holy Spirit and through communication with God, and if by

1. op. c. p.180.

2. Burghardt C. op. p.141.

3. De Adorat. 17. P.G. 68, 1076.

4. In Ioan. 9, 1. (Pusey 2, 485).

5. De Adorat. II. P.G. 68, 244.

6. De Dogmatum solutione 2 (Pusey in Joannem 3, 554).

7. In Joannam 11, 11. (Pusey 2. 730).

8. Cit. op. p.146.

dynamical holiness he means man's conscious imitation of God through virtuous living.¹ When the Holy Spirit left Adam, his participation in God was impossible, and, as we shall see later, Adam's first holy life changed, and a sinful state started for Adam.

Having lost his holiness Adam was enslaved by "sinful desire",² which became innate to him and to all men who come naturally from Adam. We shall examine this question later. This desire became the Law of sin,³ therefore had the character of sin, since it was unknown to Adam and Eve before their sin, and since it appeared only through sin.

This desire created a sinful state since it is rooted and innate to man⁴. Cyril calls this desire, natural Law.⁵ It became not only natural but also universal, and is a dirty and earthly φρόνημα⁶, or φρόνημα σαρκός.⁷ Nobody is released from this sinful desire.⁸

This φρόνημα and Infection of Soul⁹, this bad root "brings forth all passions, all sins, and is always opposed to every good, even to God, to His Will and Commandments"¹⁰ because this Law enslaves man's mind to sin,¹¹ which is opposed to man's true and spiritual good.¹² Man is

-
1. Burghardt c. op. 141.
 2. De Adorat. 1, P.G. 68, 164.
 3. C. Julian. 3. P.G. 74, 637. " Νόμος ἁμαρτίας ".
 4. De Adorat. 1. P.G. 68, 164. " ἐρριζωμένη καὶ ἔμφυτος ".
 5. Pasch. Homil. 6. P.G. 77, 501.
 6. Ibid.
 7. In Luke, 5, 28. P.G. 72, 796.
 8. In Isaian 1, 17. P.G. 70, 45. " οὐδεὶς ἀπὸ ρύπου καθαρὸς ".
 9. De Adorat. 1. P.G. 86, 176.
 10. C. Julian. 3. P.G. 74, 637. " ἐξ ἀνοσίου ρίζης ".
 11. In Psalm. 6, 3. P.G. 69, 745.
 12. Pasch. Homil. 6. P.G. 77, 501.

infected.¹ This sinful desire has the character of sin, not only for Adam but also for every one who is born into this world as descendants of Adam.

It is only through the Holy Sacrament of the Baptism that man received remission of all his sins, the original and his actual.² This shows the gravity of this sinful desire. In other words, it loses the character of guilt in each person and this stain of sin disappears and is burnt out.³

This sinful desire stops being regarded as sin in itself, stops having, in itself, a sinful character after the Christian Baptism. What remains after baptism is a power which causes and pushes man to sin. This Concupiscence has got such a power that it is now the fertile field of all sin. In man's fallen state, there is no sin of which Concupiscence is not the forerunner. That is why man so easily turns to sin and evil.

However, through baptism, Christ offers to man the power of the Holy Spirit and makes him stronger than the Devil,⁴ so that if the Christian fights with Christ against sin and evil, he will win.

Now, criticising all that we have already said about Cyril's understanding of the influence of sin on Adam and on the whole of mankind, we could come to a conclusion.

Cyril points out that, through sin, Adam on the one hand, lost his dominion over nature, his perfect Divine Sonship, his immortality and his holiness, and, on the other hand, his freedom and his rationality

1. De Adorat. 15. P.G. 68, 1001.

2. In Isaian. 1, 16. P.G. 70, 41.

3. In Isaian 1, 16. P.G. 70, 41.

4. In Genes. I' 5. P.G. 69, 29." ἀπάτης διαβολικῆς ἀποτελεῖ κρείττονα ".

became darkened, weakened, obscured and impaired, but both were not entirely lost.

If I would like to use the known theological terms, I could say that Adam through sin lost the gift's which are known as Gifts, of his Original Righteousness, Immortality, holiness, dominion, Sonship, while at the same time, the Divine Image, was, as I said, obscured and impaired, but not entirely lost. These two elements, freedom and rationality, belonged to Adam's nature and because both were not entirely lost, even after sin, Cyril says that death and corruption from sin did not destroy the human being entirely.¹ Man was not destroyed entirely, the human being did not become inhuman.² Man, as a vessel was broken through sin, and the pieces would have to be united and man ^{to be} restored and later sanctified through Christ.

I think that this is the mind of Cyril even when he speaks of a complete disappearance of the Image of God.³ Cyril, in these instances does not use the word Image in the narrow theological sense, freedom - rationality etc. - but in the sense of Adam's general, Spiritual and original state before sin.

Because the Image of God in Adam was not entirely lost, Cyril says that man, even after Adam's sin, has the power to turn towards good or evil and to choose according to his free will.⁴

If man had entirely lost his free will, he could not choose what he wills, and if he can choose what he wills, his freedom is not completely lost. Furthermore, Cyril says, not only has a man a strong ability to choose freely what he prefers, but also this power of his

-
1. In Genes. 4' P.G. 69, 24.
 2. Burghardt op. c. p.144.
 3. De Incarnat. Unig. P.G. 75, 1477.
 4. De Adorat. 6, P.G. 68, 453.

mind is strong, as well.¹ In many cases Cyril speaks not of an entire and full loss of the divine Image in Adam, but of an Image which through sin was marked falsely², and the beauty of which was destroyed³ but not entirely lost. In other cases Cyril uses also the word "character" instead of Image and then he says that man's Character did not remain as bright as it was before Adam sinned.⁴ This character became dimmer and darker.⁵ The comparative adjective "dimmer" used by Cyril, shows three things: The character-Image of God in Adam did not remain as it was before his sin; it became dimmer. But this shows that Cyril does not speak of an entire loss of Adam's Image. It did not disappear entirely.

Through Sin man was falsely stamped, became "ugly"⁶, lost his first beauty. But the meaning of "ugly" presupposes something which exists though ugly. So the Image of God still exists in man but not with the beauty which it had before sin.

This problem of the influence of sin on the Divine Image in man is a difficult and old one. We can see a twin tradition in the early Church Fathers and writers.

Irenaeus presented the one tradition, according to which the Image of God in man was lost through sin.⁷ This other tradition was represented by Origen according to whom the Image was very obscured but not lost,⁸ while some other Fathers, like Athanasius seems to speak of

1. De Adorat. 16. P.G. 68, 1037. "ἔρρωται πως ὁ νοῦς".

2. In Psalm. 50, 13. P.G. 69, 1100.

3. De Trinit. Dial. A. 6. P.G. 75', 1013.

4. C. Anthropom. 5. P.G. 76, 1085. "οὐκέτι λαμπροί μεμενήκασιν οἱ τῆς πρὸς τὸν

5. In Ioan. 2, 1. Pusey 1, 183. (and P.G. 73, 205.)/θεὸν ὁμοιώσεως χαρακτῆρες".

6. De Trinit. Dial. 6. P.G. 75, 1013. De Adorat. 1. P.G. 68, 149. "ἀκαλλές".

7. Adv. Haereses 5, 16, 1.

8. In Genesius, Homilia 13, 4.

both together, namely of an Image which was simply tarnished¹ and an Image which was destroyed.² Gregory of Nyssa speaks of both, i.e. on the one hand of the loss of the Image,³ while, on the other hand, he speaks of the Image as being blurred and obscured, but not lost.⁴

Cyril probably knew this twin tradition. The existence of this double tradition also means that this problem was not finally solved in Cyril's time, officially by the Church.

And although Cyril, on the one hand, says that sin marred the beauty of the Divine Image and Satan filled the radiant fall of humanity with sordidness,⁵ however, he insists that despite sin "we have lost none of our essential components".⁶ Man has not lost anything which is necessary for him to remain physically human, a rational, mortal being, capable of understanding and knowledge". That is why Cyril says that we have suffered no injury to our nature, for we have not, by any means, come into "not being", we do exist, physically without virtue.⁷ In the passages above mentioned, Cyril seems to consider these two elements, freedom and rationality, as belonging essentially to man's nature. Thus since man has not lost his nature entirely, has not become inhuman, these elements could not be lost entirely.

Cyril uses the word Image sometimes for the general spiritual state of Adam before sin, when he speaks of the loss of the Image. This general state of Adam did not remain the same after sin although that the real Image of Adam in the special sense was obscured and impaired,

1. Contra Gentes. 8, P.4. 25, 16 /// 34. P.4. 25, 68-69.

2. De Incarnatione Verbi 6, P.4. 25, 105-8.

3. De Virginitate 12, 8/1, 2 99.

4. De Beatitudinibus 6 P.4. 44, 1272.

5. Resp. ad Tiberium 8. Pusey: In Ioannem 3, 590.

6. Resp. at Tiber. 10. Pusey: In Ioannem. 3, 594.

7. De Sancta et consub. Trinitate. dial. I. P.G. 75, 676. "ὁδραμῶς εἰς τό μή / ὑπάρχειν ὅλως".

but not entirely lost.

In this sense I agree with Burghardt¹ who says that those aspects of the Image, which are part of man's essential structure - basic rationality and psychological freedom - were not lost. Those facets of the Image which owe their existence to the Indwelling of the Spirit - holiness, incorruptibility, kinship with God - were lost.

ADAM'S SIN AS GUILT.

As I have said, Sin is considered not only as a sinful state but also as a guilt. Christian Salvation, moreover, is a real Salvation, both from this sinful state of corruption and from guilt. Guilt is the special characteristic of sin, because without guilt, sin is not real sin, but only an imperfection, or lacking or a natural evil. Sin, however, is something more. We speak of guilt in relation to God and His Righteousness. The transgressor and sinner should justify the Divine Law and re-establish the disturbed Order.

Sin can be considered both as one concrete, actual sinful deed or a sinful state which is the sinful basis for all actual sins. Therefore guilt, generally speaking, exists in every actual sin as well as in the sinful state.

The original sin had both characteristics; it was an actual sin of Adam, and a sinful state, which is opposite to the Divine Law and Will and which is communicated to all men², so that all men are (considered) guilty.³ "ἐνεχόμεθα καὶ ἅπασιν ταῖς τῆς παραβάσεως αἰτίαις"

The problem now is: How does Cyril understand the relation between Adam's sinful state and guilt, on the one hand, and our sinful state and guilt, on the other. How did it come about that all men are guilty?

1. op. c. p.153.

2. In Rom. 5, 18. P.G. 74, 789.

3. De Trinit. Dial. 6.
P.G. 75, 1016.

the sin of Adam?¹ This is Cyril's question.

The question, how did it happen that sin came to be at all, is now united with the question, how does it happen that sin came through one, Adam, to be in all men..

In order to understand Cyril and to estimate his understanding of this problem, we should say that to this great question, there can be the following answers:

- (a) The theory of Pelagius, who said that Adam sinned and died, and all other people sin in imitation of Adam, without inheriting any guilt from him, and that they die only for their own sins:
- (b) The theory of Albert Pighius and Ambrosy Catharin who said that the original sin was an actual sin of Adam's only, but that God reckoned this sin externally as man's sin:
- (c) The theory of Augustine who understood the famous phrase
ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον Rom. 5, 2. in the sense of
"relative" pronoun (= in whom (Adam) all men sinned).
All men sinned because all men existed in that one Adam, and the free action of Adam was at the same time the free action and had the free consent of all men.
- (d) The theory according to which Adam sinned not as a person but as the representative of the whole of humankind as Christ acted as representative of all men.

As we have seen, sin is both the sinful action and the sinful state which is the basis for sinful action and which is opposed to

¹. In Rom. 5, 18. P.G. 74, 788.

God's law. We can say the same for the original sin. Adam's sin consisted both of a sinful action and a sinful and guilty state. This sin, however, was not committed by all men and, therefore, it does not contain any personal guilt in it, but it has been inherited by all men as a sinful and guilty state. While for Adam the transgression was free and personal, for us it is inherited and inevitable. While for Adam it was both a sinful action and a sinful state, for us it is only the sinful state in which we are born.

"We have become sinners through the disobedience of Adam in this way: he was created in order to be incorrupted and living. His life was holy in the Paradise and His Mind was occupied by the vision of God; his body was calm and quiet, for no bad sin disturbed him. But since he fell into sin and Corruption, sin and iniquities entered into his nature and the wild Law, which is within ourselves, appeared. Thus the (human) nature sinned by the disobedience of one, i.e. of Adam, and thus the many became sinners, not because together with Adam transgressed the Command, for they did not exist then, but are descendents of his nature which fell under the Law of Sin."¹

Here we can see Cyril's answer which is:

(a) apposed to the theory of Pelagius, because Cyril says that all men inherit the guilt of the original sin as a sinful state.

(b) opposed to the theory of Pighius and Catharin because Cyril does see an inner relation between Adam and humankind, and therefore the guilt of human kind is not considered only externally. How could God punish all men for an actual sin of Adam?

(c) Opposed to the theory of St. Augustine, because Cyril says that all

1. In Rom. 5, 18. P.G. 74, 788, 9. "Ἀμαρτωλοὶ γεγόναμεν διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ Ἀδάμ διὰ τοιοῦνδε τρόπον: πεποίητο μὲν ἐπὶ ἀφαρσίᾳ καὶ ζωῇ... Ἐπειδὴ δὲ πέπτωκεν ὑφ' ἁμαρτίαν... ἐντεῦθεν εἰσέδραμε τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς φύσιν ἡδοναί τε καὶ ἀκαθαρσίαι, ἀνέφν δὲ καὶ ὁ ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ἡμῶν ἀγριαίνων νόμος. Ἐνεδόκηκεν οὖν ἡ φύσις τὴν ἁμαρτίαν διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἐνός, τοῦτέστι τοῦ Ἀδάμ, οὕτως ἀμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν αἱ πολλοὶ οὐχ ὥς Ἀδάμ συμπαραβεβηκότες, οὐ γὰρ ἦσαν κώποτε, ἀλλ' ὥς τῆς ἐκείνου φύσεως ὄντες"

men have become sinful not, in the sense that all men have sinned personally in Adam. If Cyril had accepted this theory of Augustine, he would have to accept the idea that, in Adam, all men existed as persons, knowing, thinking and willing the same things with him and that Adam's will was not personal but the will of all mankind, so that every action of Adam's was at the same time, the action of all men.

But both these ideas are rejected by the above-mentioned phrase of Cyril. The will of a person is personal, and the personal will of each one was not the personal will of Adam. The personal will of each person existed only generally, not as a real and personal will, but as in the first root of mankind.¹

If Cyril had accepted this theory, he should have to accept the idea that moral relations can be inherited, which seems to be impossible.

Therefore Cyril understands the phrase of St. Paul ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον not as St. Augustine did, namely not in whom Adam all men sinned but because all men sinned.

(d) Cyril tried to approach our question and to give an answer by stating that the original sin is inherited by all men as a sinful state in which we are born, because all men come, physically from the same corrupted nature of Adam. This is the only way in which Cyril understands the inheritance of the original sin to all men. The two things, guilt and the sinful state are organically related. However, we have to confess that here we are facing a great mystery.

1.

In Ioan. 14, 30. P.G. 74, 328.
 "οἶδόν τινα κληῖρον ἐκ πατρὸς εἰς ὅλον τό ἐξ αὐτοῦ διήκον γένος τὰς ἐκ τῆς
 τοῦ Ἀδάμ παραβάσεως συμφορὰς ἐσχήκαμεν"

Chapter Four

Necessity of Salvation

We can speak of the necessity of Salvation of Man's Salvation in two ways; on the part of God and on the part of man.

I. Cyril has not even the slightest doubt that Man's Salvation like his first Creation, was only a free action of the eternal and saving love of God, His Love is the source of all good things.¹ Salvation is a gratuitous work of God's mercy.² God is Love³ and Freedom⁴. Thus God is free Love and Loving Freedom. God in His free Love decided the salvation of man and in His Loving Freedom He chose the best way to do it. God was not bound by any necessity to save the transgressor man. He is "beyond any need"⁵ and because God was not responsible, nor guilty either for man's sin or for his corruption and punishment. Cyril, however, in one at least case, says that, "it was not proper for God, because of His Love to be indifferent to the sufferings and corruption of His creatures."⁶ Love and moral indifference are irreconcilable. Not only was Man's salvation not on God's part compulsory but on the contrary God had every right to judge and condemn the transgressor. From this point of view of man's punishment, God could not be accused. His judgement would be right.

II.

While man's salvation was not a compulsory action for God, it was however absolutely necessary for men.

It was about man himself and his salvation, about the healing of corrupted nature.⁷ All mankind was under sin and error,⁸ under

1. C. Julian, 7, P.G. 76, 861. "ἀπάντων αἴτιος καὶ δοτὴρ τῶν καλῶν".

2. Riviere. op. c. I. p.222.

3. In Ioan. 10, 17, P.G. 73, 1053. "ἀγάπη ὑπάρχων ὁ Θεός".

4. In Deuteronomium P.G. 69, 648. "ἐλεύθερον τό Θεῖον".

5. Ibid.

6. C. Julian 8. P.G. 76, 925-8.

7. In Genes. 1, 5. P.G. 69, 28. "τῶν ἀρρωστημάτων ἡ λύσις".

8. C. Julian 6. P.G. 76, 829. "πεπλάνηται ἡ σύμπασα ἡ γῆ".

corruption¹ and death² after Adam's sin. There was no moral reward for a good act before Christ's Incarnation, before He founded His Church as the Ark of His Grace.³ "οὐδεὶς ἦν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις μισθός ".³

All men wanted true Salvation. Therefore a New Way was necessary to be open to men so that they might be able to pass through and so reach the first and ancient state of Adam in Paradise before sin.

No man was able to offer this salvation to mankind⁴ because no man was sinless, and all men were under the power of sin and therefore each man himself first wanted to be saved.⁵ Moreover, not even angel or other being, was able to offer salvation to the whole of mankind.⁶ The Saviour had to be incomparably greater than any man, any angel or any other being.

The Sin of men was the obstacle to their relation with God. Feeling remorse of their consciences, they were always looking and longing for reconciliation with the Divine and for salvation from their guilt and misery, therefore from sin. They were longing for a new life, of happiness. Mankind was expecting, longing and asking for a Divine Saviour.

Men were feeling that they could not avoid otherwise the tyranny of the devil but only through One Mediator between God and man,⁷ a Mediator who should have divine Power and Authority and who should be

-
1. In Ioan. 8, 35. P.G. 73, 815.
 2. In Amos. 9, 11. P.G. 71, 577. "κατέσκαψεν ὁ θάνατος τὰς ἀπάντων σκηνάς ".
 3. In Zacharia 8, 10. P.G. 72, 120.
 4. Ibid. " οὐδεὶς ἀνθρώπων ἱκανός πρὸς τοῦτο ἐφαίνετο ".
 5. In Rom. 5, 20. P.G. 74, 789 // C. Julian. 6. P.G. 76, 829.
 6. Thesaurus 32, P.G. 75, 501.
 7. In Psalm. 80, 6. P.G. 69, 1201.

also a representative of mankind. Thus the Eternal Logos of God, being eternal in His Divine Nature, became "Man" for man's salvation in order to inaugurate for us a new, unique and permanent way to Salvation. He who came as man's saviour was not even an Angel but the Lord Himself.¹

All men were expecting the Saviour. Here it may have to be noted that, according to Cyril, God permitted men to remain in their sin and corruption for a length of time sufficient for all men to be able to feel both their weakness and the necessity of the Coming of the Divine Saviour.²

This pananthropic nostalgia for Saviour and Salvation was diffused among all nations and especially among the Jews. God had promised again and again that He was going to send His Only-Begotten Son as Saviour of mankind. So the Lord Jesus Christ was the One God had promised to send for men's salvation.³ The Saviour, came and appeared in the Theanthropic Person of the Incarnate Logos, Jesus Christ.

1. Thesaurus 32, P.G. 57, 501.

2. In Rom. 5, 20. P.G. 74, 792. "...ἵνα χρεωδεστάτην ἔχουσα τὴν εἰς τὸν κόσμον

3. Thesaurus 32, P.G. 75, 501. /εἰσβολὴν ἥεν Χριστῷ ὁρᾶτο δικαίως"

"ὁ πάλαι σῶζειν ὑπισχνόμενος"

PART TWO

SALVATION THROUGH CHRIST

DIVISION. I'. JESUS CHRIST AND HIS SAVING WORKFirst SectionGod and Man's SalvationChapter OneMan's Salvation and the Eternal Plan of God

The Incarnation of the Logos took place on earth as an Historical event within human history at a definite point of human time. "He died for us in the last times of that age while the divine light had not been thrown yet".¹ He came at the end of that time.² This is, an expression which refers at the same time to the end of pananthropic expectation of the Redeemer and to the end of the providential preparations, which were to make the world ready for this great event. Beforehand, it would have been too soon. Afterwards it would have been too late.³ The whole Cyrillian phrase refers to the Old Testament, the Old Covenant between God and man. That Covenant is distinguished from the New which was realized through Christ at the end of that "old age". Cyril wanted to link the two Covenants and to show that the second was the completion of the first. "The New Covenant, which manifests the mystery of Christ, was not made at the time of the Old one, neither has this New the simplicity of the old history but it has the superiority of Knowledge and doctrines", "ἐν ὑπεροχῇ γνώσεως καὶ δογμάτων".⁴ Cyril uses the word Αἰών neither in the philosophical sense of a heavenly Being as a Mediator between God and men, nor in the general sense of the whole human earthly life as opposed to the Eternal life in heaven. Cyril distinguishes between the two periods of "Time". The New One

1. Glaphyra in Exod. II. P.G. 69, 424. "...ἐν τοῖς ἐσχάτοις τοῦ αἰῶνος καιροῖς"
2. De Adoratio XVII. P.G. 68, 1068. "...πρὸς αὐταῖς τοῦ χρόνου δυσμαῖς"
3. F. Prat. The Theology of St. Paul (E.T.) London 1957. Vol. II' p.162.
4. Com. in Isaiam 8, 1. P.G. 70, 217.

started with the Incarnation of the Logos. This Incarnation is an unquestionable historical event. Cyril considers Christ both as the Eternal God and as the Incarnate Logos, the Historical Jesus. It is this Jesus Christ the Eternal God who is the cause of man's salvation and it is the same Incarnate Logos who is the cause of man's recreation and Salvation and who created the New Aion, the New Creation. While the Incarnation took place within human history at a definite time the idea of this great Mystery and of man's Salvation as well was not new for God.¹ This plan of God for man's Salvation was God's Eternal and true Plan and therefore the historical event of the Incarnation was the realization in time of that eternal Divine Plan and Will. "The mystery Christ is not recent. It was predestined before the creation of the world for God knew what was going to happen. When Adam fell, rather before he fell the Creator had found also the way of healing him in time through Christ."² Cyril says that even before the creation of the world God Knew the unfolding of man's history and was also keeping in Himself eternally as His own great Secret and as His own Will³ the plan of His Son's Incarnation.⁴ Cyril uses these words in order to show the eternity of the Divine Plan in human terms and words. Man having been creating in time and with time and being included by God's Eternity cannot understand this God's eternity. For Cyril the word *ὁ πρόσφατον* is to be understood only from the part of God. The mystery of the Incarnation was not recent or new for God.⁵ It was not discovered by

1. In Luke 5, 17. P.G. 72, 669 / In Isaiam 41, 7-8-70-832. P.G. 70, 832 / P.G. 68, 1068.

2. In Isaiam XLI. 3. P.G. 70, 832. "προενόησεν ὁ Δημιουργὸς καὶ τῆς ἐσομένης κατὰ

3. Com. in Isai. XXVI. P.G. 70, 556. /καὶ τοῦ θεραπεύειν"

4. C. Julian. 4. p.117. P.G.

5. In Luke 5, 21 (72 669) P.G. 72 669 / De Ador. 16-68 1018 P.G. 68 1018.

God recently since this mystery had been prepared by God Himself before the world was created.¹ Only for people on earth the unveiling of this eternal Divine Secret was new. Here it should be noticed that the Word " προητοίμασται" in Cyril does not mean any progressive preparation and improvement of this Plan in God's mind. Such a preparation is connected with the idea of Imperfection and change. God, however, as we have seen, is eternally perfect and unchangeable.² With this verb προητοίμασται wanted to express the great truth that God was always thinking of man's salvation. The verb "ἐσχέπετο"³ can be understood in the same sense. That is why Cyril speaks of God's Πρόνοια⁴ for man's salvation. This eternal Πρόνοια of God was expressed and realised when the "fullness of time came". God's Plan, therefore, for man's Salvation was eternal. It existed in God's Nous as Πρόνοια and not as ἀν'Επίνοια after its realization. God's Πρόνοια and Οἰκονομία are inseparable in Cyril's Theology. God's act for man is characterized by Cyril as "ἀθάλαρτος"⁵ in the sense that this was an act of God only, and was depended only on God. Cyril understands man's history as the unveiling and unfolding of the Divine Plan, Will and Thought about man and his salvation. Here, a difficult question is raised. How are God's eternal Plan, Man's sin and Apostasy, the Incarnation of the Logos and man's Salvation to be brought together? Did Salvation take place because it was only the eternal Plan of God? And since man's sin and Fall was the presuppositi-

1. Div.Hom.12.P.G. 77, 1045."προητοίμασται τό Χριστοῦ μυστήριον καί πρό αὐτῆς τῆς

2. C. Julian. 4. C.76, 677. /τοῦ κόσμου καταβολῆς"

3. Com. in Rom. 5, 20. P.G. 74, 792.

4. Thesaurus IV'. P.G. 75, 293.

5. Glaphyra in Genes. 1. P.G. 69, 20.

of his salvation in Christ did man's sin take place because it was God's eternal Plan? Did God's Plan determine man's sin so that the plan of God was the cause and the reason of man's sin? And if it is so, was God guilty of man's fall? And if He is so, why should man be guilty and punished and why the Incarnation of the Logos necessary?

The question of the inner relation between God's eternal Plan, the Incarnation of the Logos and man's salvation may be approached in the following ways: (i) Either God did not know before man's sin what was going to happen to man and it was only "at the time" of man's Fall or afterwards that God decided to send His Son for man's Salvation.

(ii) Or God had in Himself an eternal Plan for man's Creation, sin, Fall, corruption and Salvation through the Incarnation of the Logos and in this case two solutions are possible.

(a) either God had such a plan for man's creation, sin and salvation that all those events happened of necessity because the plan of God, was such, because man was unable to act otherwise, and because man had to fulfill the eternal Plan of God, or

(b) all these events happened not of necessity of the Divine Plan but also not outside of the eternal Knowledge or foreknowledge¹ of God.

In this case the plan of God is not the cause of man's sin but simply God, because of His absolute Knowledge, exists as an Eternal present, and lies beyond our understanding of present, future and past and thus it was absolutely possible for God to see in the sense of His eternal Present, what was going to happen in the sense of the human future.

1. This term is to be understood thus only on the part of man. God has His eternal Knowledge which appears to us as foreknowledge when it refers to our future.

Now what is Cyril's understanding and approaching this difficult problem? (I) With regard to the first proposition, Cyril categorically and positively denies any ignorance in God about man's Sin, Fall and Salvation. (a) the Creator did not ignore that corruption would come to man.¹ No ignorance can be ascribed to God concerning man's Fall. (b) The mystery of Incarnation is often characterized by Cyril as "Mystery not new" οὐ καινοφανές², but as one which προόριστο³ by God. Any ignorance in God would destroy His absoluteness and would mean lack of Knowledge, therefore, limitation of His Attributes and thus self-denial of God. The above mentioned phrase "mystery not new" should be understood only on God's part. It was not new for God, therefore neither was Fall of man unknown to God in the sense we have explained.

(II) Now, if we examine the other two propositions, we see Cyril's understanding of this problem. He speaks of man's fall in terms of his own guilt, absolutely out of any guilt of God. "The first man, Adam, was made and was given the way of salvation by God. He lost it because he transgressed the divine Commandment and fell into corruption was brought into sin, and fell down to death."⁴ Afterwards man needed a "new way to salvation"⁵ from God Himself for otherwise he could not avoid both the snares of sin and the ferocity

1. Glaphyra in Genes. I. P.G. 69, 25. "ὅτι συμβήσεται... τὸ παθεῖν τὴν φθορὰν οὐκ

2. Com. in Isai. XVI. 3. P.G. 70, 832. / ἡγνόηκεν ὁ Δημιουργός"

3. Com. in Rom. 5, 14. P.G. 74, 789 / Homil. Pasch. XII. P.G. 77, 104

4. Com. in Isai. P.G. 70, 280. "Γέγονεν ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος Ἀδάμ καὶ ὁδὸς αὐτῷ σωτηρίας δέδοται παρὰ Θεοῦ. Ταύτην ἀπώλεσε παραβεβηκώς τὴν θεῖαν ἐντολὴν, πέπτωκεν εἰς φθορὰν, ἡνέχθη πρὸς ἁμαρτίαν, καταβέβηκεν εἰς θάνατον"

5. Ibid. "... ἵνα ὁδὸν ἡμῖν ἐγκαινίσῃ πρόσφατον καὶ μένουσιν"

of the satanic tyranny.¹ It was for this reason that the philanthropos (man's lover) Logos of God, being non-created, by His Nature, became man for us with the Will of the Father in order to inaugurate to us a new and permanent way (to salvation²). Cyril insists that all these happened not of course, in ignorance of God but undoubtedly not because of the Plan of God. On the contrary Cyril always lays stress upon the fact that God's Knowledge was only a foreknowledge, as we have seen it, and not a cause of what happened. "He knows everything before it happens, but He allows the human things to run" and in particular he has given to each man the possibility to act as he likes,³ though nothing is impossible for God.⁴ God, because of His eternally absolute Knowledge, lying beyond any distinction between past, present and future as it is understood in human terms, knows or sees or foresees in the sense of His eternal Present what happens among men in the sense of human past, present or future. Criticizing this idea Cyril says: "God who had called them to the enjoyment of such great blessings, Knew not only in the present time but also in time of old and before the times of old in His ineffable foreknowledge what they would be like even before they came to be. For, Knowing from of old that they would be like that he was preparing blessings for them in accordance with His good Will towards them."⁴ In this passage Cyril considers God's foreknowledge as mysterious secret and unutterable. We are included

-
1. Hom. Pasch. 29. P.G. 77, 964.
 2. Thesaurus 13. P.G. 75, 280.
 3. C. Julian. III'. P.G. 76, 629. "οἶδε τὰ πάντα πρὶν γενέσεως αὐτῶν "
 4. ἡπίστατο ὁποῖοι τινὲς εἶσονται καὶ πρὸ τοῦ γενέσθαι " κατὰ τὴν ἀπόρρητον Αὐτοῦ πρόγνωσιν P.G. 74.

by God's Knowledge and therefore we cannot understand it. On the contrary, God whose Knowledge includes us, eternally sees whatever has happened or happens or will happen to us. The relation of God's Plan and of what happened to man cannot be understood in the sense that the Incarnation took place by necessity of God's Plan but in the sense that God planned so because He Knew from the high what man was going to do and to be " εἰδώς ᾔνωθεν τοιούτους ἐσομένους αὐτοῦς . I .¹ Undoubtedly man's fall took place as God Knew but not because He knew it. The same can be said of the Incarnation. God foreknew the necessity for the Incarnation.² We have seen that Cyril denied any ignorance in God. I am examining here again a Cyrillian text which we have already seen in another case.

"The Creator was not ignorant that man would come under corruption; but at the same time He Knew also to do away with the impropriety and how to destroy corruption and how to bring him back to the better state and restore the original good things. For He Knew that he would send, in due time, His own Son in human form, to die for us and to destroy the power of Death so that He might govern both the quick and the dead".³

Here the verbs οὐκ ἠγνόηκεν, ἠέλιστατο, ἦδει must attract our attention. All these verbs refer to the Knowledge of God or more correctly to God's foreknowledge. Cyril does not separate the Incarnation from God's Knowledge. The Incarnation of the Logos was planned by the Will and

1. See the above mentioned phrase.

2. C. Julian. III'. P.G. 76, 629.

3. In Genes. I. P.G. 69, 25.

Providence of God the Father.¹ Therefore Cyril sees the Incarnation as an action of God's free Love, or of His Loving freedom.² It took place at a certain time "οἰκεῖω καιρῷ"³ when the Lord willed.⁴ If we do not consider the relation between God's Plan and the Incarnation of the Logos for man's Salvation as the relation of the Divine Love and the Divine Knowledge on the one hand and man's Fall and need of Salvation on the other hand, we cannot have a complete and true understanding of this great theme. Such a consideration of this relation led Cyril to the following idea. "Our God and Father devised before hand what is good for men; He Knew that they would surely fall into corruption but sought a means of renewing them and so bringing them back to incorruption. So He planted for them roots of such hope in His own Son by nature and foreordained us to sonship and counted us worthy of all spiritual blessing even before we had been created, in order that when mankind should fall into death because of his transgression, it might spring up again into life and not be altogether under the curse."⁵ Cyril's remarks here are important. God deals with what is good, useful and necessary for man's salvation. God's Plan for man was only good since God is not simply Good but He is Goodness itself⁶ by His nature⁷ and His will is identical with Goodness.⁸ This moral perfection of God's should be

-
1. In Rom. 5, 14. P.G. 74, 785. ἐν θελήσει καὶ προμηθεΐα τοῦ Θεοῦ
 2. In Deuteron. A. P.G. 69, 648. / καὶ Πατρός"
 3. Thesaurus. 15. P.G. 75, 296.
 4. In Rom. 5, 14. P.G. 74, 785. We cannot understand the reason why God chose this time for the realization of His Will for man's Salvation. The choice of that time depends only on God's Will and Wisdom. That is why Cyril calls that time of the Incarnation οἰκεῖω καιρῷ. Cyril speaks here as God's οἰκεῖω time, which we cannot understand. This time is not limited like our human time. It should probably be noted that Cyril speaks of kairos of God and not of chronos.
 5. Thesaurus 15. P.G. 75, 293.
 6. In Ioan. 10, 17. ὁὐκ ἀγαθὸς ἀπλῶς, αὐτὸ δὲ τὸ ἀγαθὸν P.G. 73, 1053, 76, 86
 7. In Ioan. 14, 9. P.G. 74, 209 / μᾶλλον. P.G. 75, 889.
 8. C. Julian. 4. 117. P.G.

taken under consideration when we speak of God's Plan for man. It is in terms of this moral perfection that Cyril brings together God's Πρόνοια and Love for man. Cyril calls God as Father in order to lay stress on His Fatherly relation to His people. The Divine Saviour is the Divine Father of man.. God had planned man's Salvation even to the smallest detail. That is why God Knowing that man would sin, put into his nature grounds and roots for the hope of such a salvation, so that man might not be always under the curse of sin. All this happened before man's Sin and fall took place. Cyril expresses this idea in the following passage. "Now, we must see how the Wisdom of God has laid before all ages a foundation for us. It is as when a wise architect is beginning to build a house; He naturally takes thought lest as time goes on, it should suffer any of those accidents, which are liable to occur in building operations; and so he lays down an unshakable foundation devising an immovable base for the work in order that, if anything happens to it, its source may remain, and so, it may be able to rise again therefrom. In likemanner the Creator of all things made Christ the foundation of our Salvation even before the world was created in order that when we would fall by transgression, we might be rebuilt on Him. So far as concerns the mind and purpose of the Father, Christ was made the foundation before all ages: but the realizations come in its own time, when the need required it. For in the time of Christ's Incarnation we, who of old had Him as the foundation of our Salvation, are renewed in Him".¹ In this passage we see that according to Cyril the foundation of man's Salvation had been formed before his creation.

1. Thesaurus 15. P.G. 75, 296. "...ὁ πάντων Δημιουργός τῆς ἡμετέρας σωτηρίας προεθεμελίωσε τὸν Χριστόν, καὶ πρὸ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου κατασκευῆς ἵνα, ἐπειδήπερ συμβῇ πεσεῖν διὰ τὴν παράβασιν, αὐτίς ἀνακτισθῶμεν ἐκ' Αὐτοῦ"

The greek 'Επειδήπερ has to be examined carefully. It means either the conjunction of causal (= because of) or the conjunction of time (=after). Cyril uses the word here in its temporal sense. I can support this use of the word because (i) the conjunction ἐπειδήπερ with the subjunctive Mood is used only in the sense of time, and with optative Mood it is used in the sense of causality.¹ Here Cyril uses ἐπειδήπερ with Subjunctive ἐπειδήπερ συμβῇ πεσεῖν . (ii) The word αὐτίς after ἐπειδήπερ has a temporal meaning and is connected with the word ἐπειδήπερ in a sense of time. (iii) The third word ἀνακτισθῶμεν can also help us to understand the meaning of the other words. The ἀνα - means again and the ἀνα -κτισθῶμεν clarifies the meaning of time in the words αὐτίς and ἐπειδήπερ (iv) The prefix πρό (= before) of the verb προσθεμελίωσε shows clearly the temporal meaning of the whole phrase. Thus Cyril using the word ἐπειδήπερ in the sense of time shows that God had planned Christ's Incarnation so that when man had fallen, he might be re-created in Christ. (v) Cyril's whole understanding of this question helps us to understand the meaning of the word ἐπειδήπερ in the sense of time. We can not accept that Cyril used this word in the causal sense because in this case the Incarnation would be considere to have taken place of necessity and not as an action of the Free Love o God for man. This idea could destroy the Whole of Cyril's theology. After all this I am sure that Cyril even when he says that God

1. Lexikon, Liddell - Scott. p.613.

" προωριουτο τον τροπον "¹ of man's salvation he speaks of Προορισμός
κατά Πρόγνωσιν ² τοῦ τὰ πάντα εἰδότος Θεοῦ ³ and not of necessity,
so that because of this kind of Προορισμός κατά Πρόγνωσιν "the
blessing for us might have been older than the curse and the promise
of life might have been older our condemnation to death and the freedom
of Sonship might have been older than the slavery to Satan"⁴. I have
no doubt that Cyril's teaching concerning our question here is very
clear. The Incarnation of the Logos for man's Salvation took place
according to God's eternal plan but not of necessity.

-
1. In Isaia 41, 2-4 P.G. 70, 832.
 2. In Isaia 41, 2-4 P.G. 70, 832.
 3. Thesaurus 15. P.G. 75, 293.
 4. "...ἀρχαιοτέραν τῆς κατάρας τὴν εὐλογίαν καὶ τῆς εἰς
τόν θάνατον καταδίκης τὴν εἰς ζωὴν ὑπόσχεσιν"

Chapter TwoThe Holy Trinity and the Incarnation of the Logos
in the work of man's Salvation.

Cyril following the Holy Scriptures teaches that "ἐνηνθρώπισεν ὁ Υἱός".¹ It was the Eternal Logos who became Incarnate in time for man's salvation. It was the only begotten Logos of God who came in human form.² Cyril speaks of the Incarnation only of the Son. This Incarnate Son is perfect God, of the same Substance with the Father and the Spirit. He, who became true man, was God by Nature".³ The Son came in His Glory and Divine Lordship.⁴ And yet, though it was only the Son who was Incarnate, nevertheless the whole Holy Trinity was co-operating in the redemptive work of the Incarnate Son. It was God the Father who eternally willed the salvation of man, of sinful man.⁵ It was the Father's eternal Will which the Son fulfilled βουλήσει τοῦ Πατρὸς.⁶ and it was the Father who sent His Son as the Saviour of man.⁷ The Father's Will however, was also the Will of the Son. That is why Cyril uses verbs of either passive or active voice when he tries to describe the fact of Incarnation. When Cyril wants to lay stress on the fact that the Incarnation of the Logos and man's Salvation were the eternal Will of Father he uses the active voice in the verbs when the Subject is the Father "πέπομφεν τὸν Ἰδιὸν Υἱόν"⁸ and he uses the verb

1. Thesaurus 20, P.G. 75, 352. / Dialog. d. Trinit. P.G. 77, 1173.

2. Com. in Isai. 19, 20. P.G. 70, 472. "ἐν ἀνθρωπείᾳ μορφῇ"

3. C. Nest. III P.G. 76, 141.

4. Com. Isai., 14, 3. P.G. 70, 368.

5. Com in Osie 13, 14. P.G. 71, 313.

6. Thesaurus 4, P.G. 75, 280.

7. Com. in Isai. 14, 3. P.G. 70, 368.

8. Com. in Isai. 14, 3. P.G. 70, 368. "Ἄλλ' ἤλεψεν ὡς ἡδικημένους ὁπάντων Δημιουργός, πέπομφεν ἡμῖν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ Ἀντρωτὴν τὸν Ἰδιὸν Υἱόν"

in passive voice when the Logos the Subject and the Father the cause, ἀπεσπάλη μετὰ σαρκός ¹. When Cyril wants to lay stress on the fact that the Eternal Logos the Son of God, was incarnate not of necessity but wholly willingly he uses the verbs in active voice and in these cases the Logos is, the Subject and Cyril sees the "Himself" as the object, προσεχόμενον ἑαυτόν ². Here the Incarnation is an act of the Logos, of His Will. With all these expressions Cyril tries to accentuate two aspects of the same truth, or rather to present the truth in two ways. This truth is expressed in a wonderful way in this following phrase. "The Father does all things through the Son." Πάντα ὁ Πατήρ ἐργάζεται δι' Υἱοῦ ³. We see the full co-operation of the Father and the Son in the work of man's Salvation. The Holy Spirit was not absent from this great event. It was the Holy Spirit who sanctified the Virgin Mary in order to make Her pure and able to give Birth to the Saviour. Cyril says: "The Divine Spirit builds a Church in the Virgin Mary" ⁴ and "the All-holy Body which was united with the Logos was conceived through the Holy Spirit", ⁵ so that the ever Virgin Mother of God did not conceive under sin under the laws of the nature but gave birth to Her Son without sin or guilt or corruption. ⁶ Thus in the great mystery of the Incarnation the wholly Holy Trinity was co-operating and manifested "The Nature of the One Deity is recognised in the Holy and Homousios Trinity". ⁷

1. De Trin. A.6. P.G. 75, 1005.

2. De Rect. Fid. ad Reg. P.G. 76, 1396.

3. Thesaurus 29, P.G. 75, 433.

4. Thesaurus 34, P.G. 75, 616. "κτίζει τό Θεῖον Πνεῦμα ἐν τῇ Παρθένῳ Ναόν"

5. Com. in Isai. 8, 3. P.G. 70, 221. "ἐξ Ἀγίου Πνεύματος τό πανάγιον...Σῶμα"

6. Com. in Luk. 5, 22. P.G. 72, 501. "οὔτε ἐν ἀνομίαις συνέλαβεν...ἀφθόρως ἔτεκεν"

7. De Trinit. Dial. XXX, 6. P.G. 75, 1053. "ἡ τῆς Θεότητος φύσις ἐν Ἀγίῳ καί Ὁμοουσίῳ Τριάδι γινώσκεται"

Chapter Three

The Necessity of Salvation

In the mystery of Man's Salvation God is the unique Subject since it is He Who saves the sinner. Even when the sinner accepts the salvation it is God Who helps man to accept it.

(A) The question of the necessity of the Incarnation can be approached from two aspects: on the one hand on the part of God and on the other hand on the part of Man.

I'. If God is perfect in His Power, Wisdom and Love, there is no doubt that on His part the Incarnation of the Logos was not necessary because He was able to find many other ways for man's salvation. "He could help men in thousands of ways" "κατὰ μυρίους τρόπους".¹ Otherwise God could not be perfect in His attributes. That is why Cyril says that the eternal Logos needed not even His human Body for man's salvation. He is not needy. He was able to realize our salvation even through one of His Own Command".² God is the perfect rational Being and all His actions are reasonable. Since the Incarnation of the Logos was, on the part of God, not of necessity, then man's Salvation was only an action of God's free Love³ and it is to be considered as Συγκατάβασις⁴ which shows to man all God's attributes. Cyril uses the word Φιλανθρωπία⁵ to express the special application of God's Love to man. The word Ἀγάπη could mean God's Love generally but because God showed His Love after man's fall and transgression of the divine Commandment Cyril

1. Quod unus sit Christus. P.G. 75, 1321.

2. De Incarn. Unig. 18. P.G. 75, 1448. Ἡδύνατο καὶ μόνῳ προστάγματι τὴν ἡμετέραν

3. Com. in Isai. 43, 22. P.G. 70, 909. /πραγματεῦσθαι σωτηρίαν"

4. De Incarnat. Unig. P.G. 75, 1460.

5. Com. in Isai. 1, 16. P.G. 70, 41. "Ἀποκρίσασθε τὴν κηλῖδα, δικαιούντος ἡμᾶς ἐξ ἡμερότητος καὶ Φιλανθρωπίας τοῦ παρ' ἡμῶν ὑβρισμένου"

speaks of God's ἀνεξιχαλία¹ to those who were guilty and sinners and who had insulted Him.² This phrase "τοῦ παρ' ἡμῶν ὑβρισμένου" shows the gravity of man's Fall and the greatness of God's Love and ἀνεξιχαλία. It also shows the state of man after his fall. That is why, because of the gravity of man's sin God's philanthropia is ἀκρατος.³ Cyril goes on by saying that as man was unable by himself to be saved, God's Love is to be characterized as Mercy "ἔλεος".⁴ Therefore man's salvation was offered to man by God, only as Divine gift and as the fruit of God's philanthropia.⁵ If Cyril sometimes uses the phrase "πρέπον τῷ Θεῷ"⁶, it was compulsory to God he means that it was proper for God and His attributes to save His creatures. God could not refuse Himself since He is Love and Mercy.

II'. The Subjective aspect: while the Incarnation of the Logos was not necessary on the part of God, it was however absolutely necessary on the part of man, especially if God was going to demand from man everlasting punishment, since being considered in relation to God man's sin has a character, as we have seen, of unique gravity and eternal guilt.⁷

Cyril combines these two aspects of the necessity of the Incarnation when he says that God chose this way for man's Salvation because "He willed that man should participate in the whole work".⁸ It was only on man's part that the human nature had to be saved. All men were sinners and guilty.⁹ The Logos through the Incarnation assumed human nature and

-
1. Com. in Isai. 1, 16. P.G. 70, 41.
 2. Com in Isai. 30, 33. P.G. 70, 693. ἀνεξιχαλεῖ ὁ Θεός καὶ τοῖς πταλουσιν
 3. Com. in Ioan. 9, 2. P.G. 73, 948. /ἐπιδαψιλεῖται τὴν χρηστότητα"
 4. Adv. Julian. 8. P.G. 76, 925.
 5. Com. in Isai. 43, 22. P.G. 70, 909.
 6. Quod unus sit Christus. P.G. 75, 1337.
 7. See chapter of this thesis about sin's character.
 8. De Incarnat. Unig. 18. P.G. 75, 1448. "ἠθέλησεν ἔχειν τινα καὶ ἡμᾶς εἰς τὸ
 9. De Incarn. P.G. 75, 1465. /κατορθούμενον κοινωνίαν"

form, underwent all sufferings which men had to undergo and therefore in His Person the whole humankind suffered and died,¹ being represented by the Incarnate Logos. If Christ had not communicated His mystical and real Blessing to all men through our having Him as our root, mankind could not have been saved. But since Christ united Himself with our human nature we have become "co-corporated" with Him through His assuming our human nature and He has become the origin and the root of our new and real nature in Christ. We deal with this problem in a special chapter.

III'. After having seen that the Incarnation of the Logos was necessary on man's part for his Salvation and that it was only the Second Person of the Holy Trinity who was Incarnate, we are now facing another question. Why was it only the Logos who was Incarnate and not the Father or the Holy Spirit? Cyril does not examine this question in detail. However, I think that we can find Cyril's answer and understanding of this question if we bring together and examine the relation between man's creation and his Salvation. No doubt it was not impossible even for the Father to be Incarnate. Anyhow, according to Cyril "God the Father acts and fulfills all things through the Son",² so that Cyril calls the Logos "Creator whose power and Deity was manifested in the creation of the world".³ Thus as the Father through the Son created the world and therefore man in the beginning so willed the same Father to re-create man through the same Son. The Son was the One through Whom man was created and re-creatednamely saved.

1. De Incarnat. Unigeniti. De Incarn. Unig. 18. P.G. 75, 1465.

2. Thesaurus 20, P.G. 75, 345. " πάντα δι' Υἱοῦ ὁ Θεὸς καὶ Πατὴρ ἐργάζεται "

3. De Trinit. Dial. A. 4. P.G. 75, 900. " Δημιουργόν... διακηρύξειεν ἂν ὁ κόσμος ἡμῖν τὸν Λόγον "

"He, Who was able to bring all things and men into existence undoubtedly was also able to bring the fallen man into spiritual and real transformat and offer him salvation".¹ Cyril is clearer in another passage where he calls the Son "The Right Hand of the Father, who through His Son, rules all things with Divine Power and brings existence and life to those Who did not exist beforehand and brings the "good life", namely the new life of Salvation, to those who existed as beings but who had sinned and fallen".² Man was created by the Father through the Logos and it was through the same Incarnate Logos that man has received reconciliation and redemption and it was He, God the Son Who has brought us again to His Father our God."³ Here we see Cyril's understanding of the inner relation between the Creation and Redemption of man by God the Father through the Logos, Jesus Christ.

(B) In all his writings Cyril insists in the teaching that Christ was incarnate and suffered negatively, on the one hand, to deliver man from sin and its power⁴ and positively, on the other hand, to make man participant of a new life⁵ in God, true Son of God and to offer him what he had lost.⁶ This idea leads us to think that as Cyril points out, if Adam had not sinned, Christ would not have come and that if human nature were not corrupted by sin, it would not have been necessary for the Logos of God to assume this human nature in order to redeem and

1. Com. in Isai. 11, 12. P.G. 70, 965.

2. Glaphyra in Genes. 3. P.G. 69, 128.

3. Paschal. Homil. 27, P.G. 77, 929." Δι' Αὐτοῦ τὴν Καταλλαγὴν ἐσχήκαμεν"

4. Com. in Ioan. 10, 11. P.G. 73, 1036 // Com. in Isai. 53, 10.
P.G. 70, 1189.

5. Com. in I' Cor. 15, 12. P.G. 74, 894.

6. De Adoratio. B'. P.G. 68, 244."ἀνακτῆσαι τὸ ποιηθέν εἰς τὸ ἀπαρχῆς"

save it. From all that has been said we understand the purpose of the Incarnation of the Logos. Cyril finds this purpose in the Salvation of man. "The Son came not to condemn but to save the world".¹ We shall examine this whole problem in detail in other chapters.

Since man's Salvation is the purpose of the Incarnation, Cyril cannot find but only one cause of this great event and Mystery, the eternal and uncountable Love of God for His creatures, for fallen man, for corrupted man. That is why Christ being the sinless God took upon Himself all men's sins in order to destroy the power of sin.² Cyril lays stress on the greatness of God's Love when he says that Christ came to save the sinner man.³

-
1. Thesaurus 20, P.G. 75, 352. " 'Επεδήμησεν ὁ Υἱὸς οὐχ ἵνα κρίνη ἀλλ' ἵνα
 2. Com. in Isai. 53, 10. P.G. 70, 1189. / σώσῃ τὸν κόσμον"
 3. Com. in Isai. 6, 9. P.G. 70, 185.

Second SectionThe Incarnate Logos - Cyril's ChristologyChapter One

The Theanthropic Person of the Incarnate Logos

It is not our main purpose to present here a full Christology of Cyril. However, as we have said, we cannot separate Soteriology from Christology, since we cannot understand Christ's Redemptive Work apart from Himself the Redeemer and Saviour. We shall try to examine Cyril's Christological teaching very briefly in order to be able to evaluate the greatness of the Work of the Incarnate Logos.

Cyril tries to solve the basic christological problems of Christian Theology, namely; is Jesus Christ One Person? And Are there Two real and perfect Natures, a Divine and a Human in Jesus and do these remain real and perfect in their Union in this One Person? A positive answer to the first question would be the christological basis against Nestorianism; which by accepting only a moral relation between the two natures of Christ overstressed the two natures and destroyed the Unity of Christ's Person. And a positive answer to the second would be the christological principle against Monophysitism which overstressed the Unity of the two natures of Christ at the cost of destroying His Human nature.¹ The Alexandrian theologians used to lay stress mainly upon the first problem because of their conflicts with Nestorian teaching. And we should remember that Cyril was an Alexandrian

1. Androutsos c.op. p.174.

theologian. "The Christological thought of the Alexandrian School of Theology in the history of the early Church finds its highest expression before the Council of Chalcedon (451 A.D.) in the teaching of Cyril".¹ We shall try to see Cyril's approach to this problem. According to Cyril's teaching The Logos as the Second Person of the Holy Trinity co-existed with the Father and the Spirit. "The God-Logos, being co-eternal with the Father, had His being before the ages".² Although, as we have seen, the Whole Trinity was co-operating in the Work of Man's Salvation, it was only the Son-Logos who became Incarnate by assuming perfect human Nature.³ Here an important question arises. Is there any real development in Cyril's christological doctrine, especially in his doctrine concerning the perfection of Christ's human Nature? Did Cyril accept that in Christ there existed a perfect and complete human Nature with a rational Soul? This question is crucially important because if Christ's human Nature is not complete the whole work of man's Salvation is destroyed. The Nestorian Controversy divides Cyril's literary activity into two periods: the first extending to 428, is devoted to exegesis and polemics against the Arians, the second ending with his death (444) is almost completely taken up by his refutation of the Nestorian heresy.⁴ Some theologians speak of a dear development of Cyril's teaching with regard to our question and they find this

1. R.V. Sellers. Two Ancient Christologies. London 1940, p.1.

2. De Incarnatione Unigeniti, P.G. 75, 1220, - IV Epistola ad Nestorium. P.G. 75, 45.

3. De Incarnatione Unigeniti. P.G. 75, 1220 - Thesaurus 20, P.G. 75, 352. "Ἐνηθρόπῳσεν ὁ Υἱὸς ... καὶ ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι τέλειος." / ἔχων τὴν ὕπαρξιν.

4. J. Quasten, Patrology vol. III' p.119 (Antwerpen-Utrecht.)

development between Cyril's earlier and later writings. No doubt we understand Cyril's earlier christological ideas easily if we see him as a pupil of Athanasius.¹ In his earlier writings, (*Thesaurus*, *Dialog*; *de S. Trinitate*, *Homiliae*, *Commentarium in Johanni Evangelium*), we find the so-called Logos - Sarx Christology in its pure form.² However, in order to do justice to Cyril we must remember that at that time he had to fight against Ariarism (*Thesaurus* chs. 22 - ff.), his theological language was not very clear yet, and his main interest was Christ's divinity. In his earlier writings Cyril refers to the Logos and to Sarx of Christ when he speaks of Jesus Christ. He does not mention the Soul in Christ's human nature as a theological factor,³ although he mentions it as a physical factor.⁴ J. Liebaert tries to point out that in his earlier writings Cyril does not recognize even a "human Knowledge" in Christ.⁵ No doubt the Sufferings of Christ are called Sufferings of His Flesh.⁶ It was because of this language that Cyril was accused of expressing Apollinarian ideas in his early writings. When Cyril started his dogmatic fights against Nestorius his theological language became clear and his terminology sharper.

I think, as I shall try to show, that Cyril cannot be accused of Apollinarian ideas even in his earlier writings. According to the exegetical laws we have to interpret a text or an idea not only by

-
1. J. Liebart. *La doctrine christologique de Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie avant la querelle nestorienne* (Lille 1951), and A. Rehrmann, *Die Christologie des hl. Cyrillus von Alexandrien*, (Hildesheim 1902). R.V. Sellers. *Two Ancient Christologies* (London 1940). J. Maré in *J.T.C.* 3, 2509
 2. Al. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*. London 1965. p.330.
 3. Grillmeier, *op. c.* 330, 332.
 4. Easter Festal Letter. P.G. 77, 573^B // Glaphyra in Genesis 6, P.G. 69, 297C.
 5. Liebart *op. c.* 144.
 6. *Thesaurus* 24, P.G. 75, 396 // *Dialog. d. S. Trinit.* 4. P.G. 75, 868.
(Ψυχὴ = Ζωή)

itself but in accordance to the whole of someone's theology, otherwise our interpretation would be one-sided. If we take into consideration the problem of Cyril's unclear language and his main interest against Arianism we shall be able to understand Cyril's earlier christology in a very different way. We shall use texts only from his Thesaurus. Thus Cyril says: "And again if you hear, that He wept and was grieved and terrified and began to be in anguish, consider that He was Man while He was God and you are to refer to the Manhood what belongs to it. For since He assumed a body which was mortal and corruptible and subject to such sufferings, it follows inescapably that along with the Flesh He appropriates its Sufferings as well and while it suffers them He is said to suffer them Himself."¹ Here Cyril speaks of Christ's humanity, human Nature, and of Anthropos, namely of Christ in His complete Human Nature. There is no Logos.— Christology in its pure form. Cyril refers to Christ's Humanity and Anthropos and therefore an Anthropos-Christology can be found here clearly. Cyril uses the verbs ἔχλαυσε, ἔλυπθη, ἔκτοθη, ἀδημονεῖν. These verbs express clear psychological conditions which should be understood only in terms of a perfect human Nature. The Flesh itself can not have these feelings. Cyril refers these feelings to Christ, therefore to His perfect Nature, a nature with a rational Soul to which these feelings can apply. The phrase "Jesus ἑταράχθη ἐν πνεύματι" (John 13, 21) shows on the one hand the fullness of Christ's Human Nature in which a rational Soul is contained and in which Christ ἑταράχθη, and on the other hand the fact that Christ

1. Thesaurus 24, P.G. 75, 396D. Ἐάν δέ πάλιν ἀκοῆς περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἔχλαυσε καὶ ἔλυπθη καὶ ἔκτοθη καὶ ἀδημονεῖν ἤρξατο, ἐννῶει πάλιν ἄνθρωπον ὄντα μετὰ τοῦ εἶναι Θεόν, καὶ ἀνατίθει τῇ ἀνθρωπότητι τὰ αὐτῇ χρεωστούμενα. Ἐπειδὴ γάρ θνητὸν καὶ φθαρτὸν ἀνέλαβε σῶμα καὶ τοῖς τοιοῦτοις πάθεσιν ὑποκείμενον, ἀναγκαίως μετὰ τῆς σαρκὸς καὶ τὰ αὐτῆς ἰδιοποιεῖται πάθη. "

ἐταράχθη ἐν πνεύματι i.e. in His Soul, generally in His Humanity and not in His Deity. Here St. John says that Christ ἐταράχθη " in the depth of His Soul (P. Trembelas, The N. Testament with a brief Interpretation. Vol. I. 19, p.c. 582). In spirit here does not mean the Spirit but the Human Soul of Christ. Neither could we say that the Logos had taken the place of Christ's Soul. According to the Platonic Conception of Man, Humanity is constituted by the entrance of any rational, spiritual nature upon an embodied state.¹ Therefore a human soul is not necessary, but any spirit can unite itself to the flesh in a perfect Unity, and therefore that these feelings could apply to the Logos. H.M. Diepen denies that any such view, as this, is to be attributed to Cyril of Alex.²

As we shall see, Cyril speaks about the impossibility of Deity and therefore of the Logos as far as His Divinity is concerned.³ The Deity is impassible, i.e. free from "ἀδημονεῖν , κλάειν, etc.

In the above mentioned text, when Cyril uses the term body he means the human Nature of Christ, the complete Human Nature. It is to this Human Nature that Cyril refers the psychological feelings ἀνατίθει τῇ ἀνθρωπότητι τὰ αὐτῇ χρεωστούμενα . He uses the term body or sarx in the sense of Human Nature because his language was not yet clear. We see this idea expressed clearly in his later writings, when he understood the need of using clear theological language. Cyril knows

-
1. Grillmeier op. c. I. 105. Norris, R.A. Manhood and Christ. Oxford. 1963, p.96.
 2. Aux origines, de l'Anthropologie de Saint Cyrille p.33. Paris 1957.
 3. Thesaurus 24. P.G. 75, 396 (ibid).

that Christ came for the Salvation of the Whole Man. That is why Christ ἰδιοποιεῖται τὰ πάθη τῆς σαρκός , he makes them His Own and as His Nature was complete, He was able to save the whole Nature of Mankind. Cyril's main interest was Christ and Christology. It would be impossible for him to spoil and destroy the whole doctrine of Christ and His Redemptive Work. We shall use a second text again from Cyril's Thesaurus. " Εἰ δέ , ὅτε γέγονε σὰρξ , ἀνθρωπίναις ἐχρήσατο φωναῖς , ἵνα ὄντως ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἄνθρωπον ὄντα δείξῃ , πῶς οὐκ ἀκόλουθον εἰς τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα φέρειν τὰ ἀνθρωπίνως εἰρημένα ; εἰ δέ γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος , συγχωρεῖτω λαλεῖν καθὼς ἄνθρωπος ".¹ Here again Cyril speaks of ἄνθρωπος , of ἀνθρωπίναις φωναῖς , ἀνθρωπότητα (=ἀνθρωπίνη φύσις) , ἀνθρωπίνως εἰρημένα . We find the Anthropos-Logos form of Christology here both verbally in the use of the above mentioned words and in their deep meaning. Cyril speaks of Christ's whole Humanity, which cannot but include a rational Soul. We saw the theological reason for using such terms in the former text. Here again, when Cyril uses the term *sarx*, he means the whole humanity of Christ. We understand this idea if we examine this term in its relation to the whole text and particularly in its relation to the terms Man, Humanity, Human words, Human voices. Cyril is a biblical theologian and he knows that in the New Testament the term *σὰρξ* means the whole Humanity of Christ. Since Cyril refers to Christ's Humanity in these writings we need not deny that he refers to Christ's Soul as a theological factor. If Christ has a Soul, then this

1. Thesaurus, 22. P.G. 75, 369.

Soul being a part of His Human Nature cannot be but a theological factor necessary for the work of man's salvation. Here again we face the same problem of Cyril's indistinct or *ambiguous* theological language.

Therefore I cannot agree with Grillmeier when he says that "Christ, in the theological interpretation given by the young Cyril, is no more than Logos and Sarx"¹ if by sarx he excludes the rational Soul from Christ's human nature. Our opinion is that even the young Cyril refers to Christ's physically perfect humanity and when he speaks of sarx he means the whole Human nature of Christ.

In his late writings Cyril's terminology becomes clear and so there is no problem. Cyril speaks clearly about the perfect Human nature of Christ.² After 429 Cyril's theological activities are devoted to his fight against Nestorianism and his theological language is very clear concerning our question and his terminology more pointed.

From 429 Cyril had to fight against Nestorius and all his attention was focussed on the problem of the Unity of the Two Natures in Christ though he never fails to distinguish them. In this case the great question was how to understand and how to express this unity of and this distinction between the Two Natures in Christ. The meaning of the word

1. Grillmeier op. c. 333.

2. De Incarnat. Unit. P.G. 75, 1220. "Οὐδέ μόνον ἡμπέσχετο σάρκα ψυχῆς ἐρήμην τῆς λογικῆς, γεγέννηται δέ κατ' ἀλήθειαν ἐκ γυναικός... καὶ ἔστιν ὡπερ ἐν θεότητι τέλειος, οὕτω καὶ ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι τέλειος, ἐκ δυοῖν τελειοῖν, ἀνθρωπότητος λέγω καὶ θεότητος, εἰς ἓνα καὶ τὸν Αὐτὸν παραδόξως συνδοξίμενος"

physis was probably the most difficult problem.¹ Cyril is not so definite in his using of either the terms "Hypostasis" or physis.² Sometimes physis for Cyril means Person, Hypostasis.³ "ὑποστάσεων γέγονε Σόνοδος"⁴ In this passage hypostasis means physis and Cyril wants to lay stress on the Unity of Two different Natures in Christ. This conception of Hypostasis is connected with the idea of existence⁵ or substance of Reality.⁶ However these terms Hypostasis and Physis are not always identical.⁷

1. In his book "An Introduction to Metaphysics" (E.T. by R. Manheim London, 1959) Heidegger examines the question of physis from the philosophical point of view. By the Greeks the "Essent" (= existent, a thing that is) was called physis.
Physis means "self-blossoming emergence", opening up, unfolding. The verb *phyein* means to grow or, make to grow. Again this does not mean simply to increase quantitatively, to become larger.
Physis is something more; it is being itself, by virtue of which essents become and remain observable. Therefore it is not only natural phenomena (p.14). The greek word "physis" derives the verb *phain* (the Indo-European stem is *bhu*, *bheu*) which means to emerge, to be powerful, of itself, to come, to stand and remain standing. The idea of "emerging" is relating to the idea of "growing". This is defined by presence and appearance. The word "physis" is also connected with the verb "phainesthas" and thus physis would be that which emerges into the light, and *phyein* mean to shine, to give light, and therefore to appear. (p.71). Here there is the idea of truth, or really being.
2. Bethune-Baker. Nestorius and his teaching. Cambridge 1908. p.172.
3. MacKintosh, H.R. The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ. Edinburgh, 1912. p.207.
also: Bardenhewer O. Patrologie p.365.
Quasten J. Patrology. III. 139.

However he never speaks of two Natures.
Harnack. Dogmengeschichte, E.T. by E. Speirs London 1898. Vol.IV. p.176.
4. Apolog. ctr. Theoderet. P.G. 76, 396.
5. Thesaurus 20, P.G. 75, 341. "ὑποστάσις ἡ εἰς τὸ εἶναι παραγωγὴ ὑπαρξίς"
6. Apol. c. Theoderetum A'. P.G. 76, 396.
7. Physis is identified with the Secondary substance and Hypostasis with the Primary Substance of Aristotle. McIntyre J. The Shape of Christology London 1966, p.82.

Cyril's asserts that after His Incarnation the Logos remains true God, His divine Nature has not changed at all. The Logos remains what He was, God.¹ The Incarnation has not changed the divine Substance of the Logos. Cyril's works are full of this idea and of such expressions which are to be found 16 times in Adv. Nestori, 7 in Apologia Adv. Oriert 15 in De Recta Fide ad Reginas, 9 in Quod unus sit Christus, and 10 in Scholia. Expressions similar to these are to be found even more frequently in his writings.² However Cyril sees a new state. After the Incarnation, His self-emptying³ the Logos is not only God, as He was beforehand. But while He remains God He has added to His eternal Being something new, something that he had not before.⁴ He assumed human nature and took the form of a servant⁵ and He became, through His Incarnation, Theanthropos the Logos, while He was Incorporeal *ἀσώρητος* before the Incarnation, now afterwards He is *σώρητος*⁶. Cyril does not separate the Logos from His Humanity after His Incarnation because this would destroy the great Mystery of the Incarnation.⁷ Since the two Natures were mysteriously⁸ but really united in Christ, the Person of Christ is One⁹. Jesus Christ very God and very Man does not mean that in Jesus Christ God and a man were really side by side, but it means that Jesus Christ the Son of God and thus Himself true God is also a true man. But this man exists inasmuch as the Son of

1. Adv. Nestorii blasphemias III. P.G. 77, 112. "...μετά τοῦ εἶναι, ὃ ἦν, ...θεός"

2. Epistola IV ad Nestorium, P.G. 77, 45 also P.G. 77, 232.

3. De Recta Fide ad Reginas (1) ed. Pusey VII pt. 1. p.238.

4. De Rect. Fide ad Reg. 1. Pusey I. 238.
Adv. Nest. 11, 12. " VI. p. 126.

5. Quod. Unus sit Christus. Pusey VII. 1, 373.

6. Apologia ad Theodorum. X. Pusey VI. 474.

7. Adv. Nest. 11. 12. Pusey VI. 126 = Explan. XII. 11. Pusey VI. 245

8. De Incarn. Unig. P.G. 75, 1220.

9. Epist. ad. Succensum I. P.G. 77, 229.

God is this man, not otherwise.¹ This Union is ἀληθής ², κατὰ φύσιν, ³ φυσική ⁴, καθ' ὑπόστασιν ⁵. Since the Nestorian assertion of a "mere conjunction or "contact" is to be utterly rejected, nothing but a hypostatic Union will serve (H.R. Mackintosh. The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ, Edinburgh 1912 p.206.)

In order to describe the Union Cyril uses the adjectival form of the terms physis (nature) and hypostasis. So he speaks of it as hypostatic and natural union. (Bethune-Baker. Nestorius and his teaching. Cambridge 1908. p.172). If we ask how this Unity took place in the One Person of Christ, Cyril will answer that this Unity remains ἀπόρρητος παντελῶς ⁶, ξένα καὶ ὑπὲρ νοῦν ⁷, ἀπερινόητος ⁸, ἄφραστος ⁹, μυστική ¹⁰, παράδοξος ¹¹, βαθεῖα καὶ ἀπόρρητος ¹² ἄρρητος ¹³. All these words characterize the greatness of the Mystery of the Incarnation and the Importance of man's Salvation.

Cyril calling the Union of the two Natures in Christ hypostatic, natural and true avoids all the other dangerous and wrong expressions which would detract from the Mystery of the Incarnation. He rejects the "change of the body into the nature of Deity"¹⁴. He avoids the

-
1. K. Barth. Kirchliche Dogmatik. E.T. by G.W. Bromiley, Edinburgh 1956. p.151.
 2. Adv. Nestor. l. 6, 11. P.G. 76, 60.
 3. De Rect. Fid. ad Reg. P.G. 76, 1220.
 4. 3 Anath. P.G. 77, 120.
 5. Adv. Nest. l. P.G. 76, 20 = Epist. IV ad Nest. P.G. 77, 45.
 6. Apolog. XII ad Orient. P.G. 76, 324.
 7. Quod unus sit Christus P.G. 72, 1292.
 8. De Rect. Fid. ad Theodor. P.G. 1200.
 9. Apolog. XII c. Orient. P.G. 76, 352.
 10. Adv. Nest. IV P.G. 76, 187.
 11. Explan. XII. P.G. 76, 300.
 12. De Incarn. Unig. P.G. 75, 1217.
 13. De Adoratio in Spiritu... P.G. 68, 593.
 14. Epist. XLV P.G. 77, 232.

term conjunction as being too weak to express the whole fact of the Union, and also the expression Identity of worth namely a moral Union.¹ All these are insufficient to express the natural Union of the Natures. "There is One Christ and One Son and One Lord, not as if a man had a simple conjunction or identity of worth to God, as the equal worth does not unite the Natures. For instance, Peter and John are of the same worth each to other since both being apostles and holy pupils. And yet the two are not one This is insufficient for a 'natural' Unity".² Cyril does not agree either with the word μέθεξις σχετική because relatively all men can be united to God but not naturally. Cyril uses only the expressions "real, perfect, natural and hypostatic union and by them he means the Union, which being real and mysterious, neither confuses nor divides the two natures in Christ,³ and so the Incarnate Logos is "perfect in Deity and perfect in Humanity, He Himself being understood in One Person".⁴ The human nature of the Lord had never a separate hypostasis or person, but the Logos without changing into Flesh or changing in a man, "united hypostatically flesh inanimated with rational Soul and became Man".⁵

We meet with a difficulty when we want to examine Cyril's famous phrase "Μία physis tou Theou Logou σε sarcomen's".⁶ This phrase appeared (1) in "Ad Jovianum"⁷, a writing which was attributed to

-
1. Epist. ad Nestor. 3. P.G. 77, 109, 112.
 2. Epist. XVII. P.G. 77, 112.
 3. Epist. IV ad Nest. P.G. 77, 45
 4. Adv. Nest. II. 6. P.G. 76, 85 = De Incarn. Unig. P.G. 75, 1220.
 5. Ep. 4. ad Nest. P.G. 77, 45. Trembelas p. op.c. II' 97.
 6. Ep. 4 ad Nest. P.G. 77, 45 / De Recta Fid. ad. Reg. 1, 9. P.G. 77, 241. Apol. ad Orient. VIII (Pusey VI, 318).
 7. (Lietmann H. Apollinarins and seine schule. p. 251).

Athanasius, and Cyril used it as an Athanasius phrase. Neither Athanasius nor Gregory used this formula, as it was believed.¹ Since, as we have seen, for Cyril Nature does not mean Substance but Person, Hypostasis, Cyril understood this formula not at all in the sense of Confusion of the Two Natures but in a new, different way.

Three questions arise from examining this formula:

- (1) What did he mean by each one of the words of this formula?
- (2) What did Cyril mean by this phrase? and (3) Why did Cyril use it?

I' (a) As we have seen, in Cyril's writing *Physis* indicates, Person, Hypostasis. It was only thus that Cyril could avoid and reject the Nestorian division of the Two *Physeis*. In fact, this usage continued to the end of great patristic period.² For this reason Cyril did not like to use the term *physis* for the human Nature of Christ. He wanted to avoid the danger of a Nestorian understanding of Christ's Humanity as a separate Person.

(b) The Word "Mia-One" in Cyril's Christology undoubtedly does not mean One perfect and Complete *Physis* as the result of the Union of Two incomplete Natures. In this phrase the *Physis* of the Logos is the subject of the whole sentence. The "One" *Physis* indicates the Person to Whom this divine substance belongs. His *Physis* is His *Physis* - Person.³ Thus "One" can be understood either in the sense that the One *physis* of the Logos is made Flesh or in the sense that the *Physis* of the Logos made Flesh is One.

1. (Van den Dries. The Formula of Cyril of Alexandria: *Mia physis* Rome 1939, p.9).

2. (R.V. Sellers. The Council of Chalcedon. London 1953, p.139).

3. V.D. Dries op. c. p.132.

(c) Cyril prefers the participial form "sesarcomeni" and not the noun sarx because he did not want to use the word sarx in the sense of physis. He tried to avoid anything which might have seemed to agree with Nestorius' division of the Two Natures. The participle "sesarcomeni", with the verb (esti = is) which does not exist in the sentence but is easily meant as a predicate qualifies the subject of the formula.¹

Now, since, as we have already seen in Cyril's writings Physis means Hypostasis - Person² and not substance, Cyril was able to understand this formula not in the sense of Confusion of the Two Natures but in his own orthodox way. In Jesus Christ the Eternal Logos Himself (The Physis of God the Logos) has become Flesh (Incarnate). Yet He is still One and the Same Person (The One Physis), though the Same Person now is Incarnate.³ Therefore Cyril meant the Common Nature of Divinity in the Hypostasis of Logos, being Incarnate, namely having the human Nature, not in a separate hypostasis, but enhypostatos in the One Hypostasis of the Logos.⁴

1. See details in V.D. Dries op. c. p.156.

2. Apol. c. Theodoret. P.G. 76, 396.

3. R.V. Sellers. The Council of Chalcedon. London 1953, p.138-9.

4. Trembelas P. op. c. II' 98.

Chapter TwoThe Incarnate Logos and the Impassibility of Deity

Now, the two Natures doctrine offered the condition for precise ascription of passibility to the Lord's Manhood, though through the Communicatio Idiomatum the divine Person should be spoken of as truly the Subject of the human experiences.¹ Cyril was the Father of this Two Natures doctrine. Therefore he had to face this problem of Impassibility of Christ's Divine Nature in his christological writings.

Cyril knows that the idea of the Impassibility of Christ's Deity does not destroy the doctrine of the two Natures, since it was the one Theanthropic Person who suffered in His Human Nature which was not confused. In addition to that idea the Uniqueness of this Theanthropic Person gives all its Significance to the Work of Man's Salvation. Because this Union of the two natures was perfect from the very beginning, in the Womb of the Virgin Mary, Cyril speaks of a God who was born $\sigma\upsilon\rho\chi\iota\tilde{\omega}\varsigma$ ² or of a God manifested in flesh,³ or of a God with the flesh⁴, or even of a God who suffered and died in the flesh $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \sigma\upsilon\rho\chi\iota$ ⁵. Here we have to notice that Cyril does not speak of the Deity who suffered but only of God, the personal God who suffered. This distinction is necessary to show that according to Cyril the Deity is impassible and therefore the Incarnate Logos suffered not in

-
1. J.K. Mozley, *The Impassibility of God*. Cambridge, MCMXXVI. p.87.
 2. Anath. XII. in Apol. ad. Theod. ed. Pusey VI 492.
 3. De Rect. Fid. ad Reg. (1) Pusey VII. 1. p.297.
 4. De Rect. Fid. ad Reg (1) Pusey VII. 1. 173.
Schol. XI Pusey VI. p.520.
 5. Anath. VII (1) Pusey VI 492. (1)

His Divine Nature as such which is impassible and incorporeal¹ but He suffered only in His Human Nature, and not apart from it, in His Flesh.² The Person of the Incarnate Logos suffered in so far as His humanity suffered. It happened because by the hypostatic Union the Flesh which suffered was His Own Flesh and the theanthropic Person was the Subject of the Sufferings. In his fourth letter Cyril says: "We say that he suffered and rose again not meaning that the Logos of God suffered in His own nature, stripes or piercing by nails or the rest of the wounds; for the Deity as such is impassible, since it is incorporeal; but because the body was made His own suffered these things, He Himself is said to have suffered for us; for the impassible One, was in the body, which suffered We have the same understanding in the matter of His death; for the Logos of God is immortal by nature and incorruptible and is life and life-giving. And again, because it was His own body which tasted death for all men by the grace of God, as Paul says, He Himself is said to have suffered death for us: not as having experienced death in His own nature (to say or to think that would be madness) but because as I have already said, His Flesh tasted death".³ Here again Cyril says that it was not the Deity but the God, the Incarnate Logos, who suffered. This is very important. We have here Cyril's clear teaching concerning our question.

In order to express all his ideas about this question Cyril uses a

-
1. Epist. IV ad Nestor. P.G. 77, 48.
 2. Anath. XII in Apol. ad Theod. ed. Pusey VI. 492.
 3. Epist. IV P.G. 77, 48.

very characteristic phrase. "The Logos suffered without suffering" $\bar{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\theta\epsilon\nu \bar{\alpha}\pi\alpha\theta\omega\varsigma$ ¹. Here we have exactly what we need in order to understand Cyril's teaching". This phrase expresses both the Sufferings of the Logos as real sufferings and not in a docetic sense and the way in which He suffered. We have seen already how Cyril understands this. The whole question of the Impassibility of Christ's Deity and His own Sufferings can be accepted and understood only through the doctrine of Communicatio Idiomatum. Cyril insists again and again in characterizing the Body which suffered as Christ's Own Body². Here Cyril teaches that the Logos remained Impassible while His Body was Suffering. We find such expressions very often in Cyril's writings. Now, Cyril stresses the important point that the Union of the five natures did not destroy their "difference, each nature did not lose its own elements".³

Passibility is property of the humanity and it continued belonging to Christ's Humanity even after the Incarnation. Impassibility, Cyril says, is a property of Deity⁴ and it also remained as such after the Incarnation. In his works Cyril explains the reason why Christ is said to have suffered. "Ὁ Λόγος οἰκειοῦται τῆς ἰδίας σαρκός, ⁵ ὅτι τοῦ Μονογενοῦς ἰδίου ἦν καὶ οὐχ ἑτέρου τὸ σῶμα .⁶ Because the properties of His Deity are His own and the properties of His Humanity are His Own, all these properties are His Own.⁷ We have to remember that Cyril was an Alexandrian theologian and the Theological School of Alexandria, with its philosophical idealism with its stress on the true

1. Quod. unus sit Christus. ed. Pusey VII. 1. 402 -

2. De Rect. Fid. ad. Reg (11) ed. Pusey VII. /1/. 310.

3. Epist. IV ad Nest. P.G. 77, 45. "ταῦτα πέπονθε τὸ γεγονός ἰδίον Ἀποῦ σῶμα..."

4. Epist. IV ad Nestor. P.G. 77, 45. "Ὁὐκ ἀνῆρέθη ἡ τῶν φύσεων διαφορά"

5. Comment in Evang. Ioanni. ed. by Au. E. Aubert 305C / also C.I. Prestige God in Patristic thought. London 1936. page 14.

6. Thesaurus 24, P.G. 75, 396.

7. Adv. Nestor P.G. 76, 20.

8. Pasch. VII. 1. 355.

Knowledge, with the use of the via negativa for expressing the absolute transcendence of God, was a great Supporter of the Conception of God's Impassibility.¹

When Cyril speaks of two different natures in Christ² he attributes to each nature its own special properties and so on the one hand growth³ and increase hunger and weariness belong to His Human nature, particularly to His Body, and fear, grief and conflict belong to the same Humanity particularly to His rational Soul,⁴ while on the other hand He attributes to His Divine Nature everything which belongs to Deity so that we "can understand His Divine Nature".⁵

Cyril in his Thesaurus expresses this idea in detail: "And again if you hear it said that He wept and was grieved and terrified and began to be in anguish, consider that He was Man while He was God and you are to refer to the Manhood what belongs to it. For since He assumed a body which was mortal and corruptible and subject to such sufferings it follows inescapably that along with the Flesh He appropriates its Sufferings as well and while it suffers them He is said to suffer them Himself".⁶

Some of Christ's sayings in the gospels are human and some divine. "I recognize that the Lord speaks now in a divine and now in a human fashion because He is at once God and Man"⁷ says Cyril who also speaks about human and divine actions. 8
 θεϊκῶς τε ἅμα καὶ σωματικῶς ἐνεργῶν

1. J. Mozley op. c. P. 52.

2. Epist. IV ad Nestor. P.G. 77, 45.

3. Apol. adv. Orient. IV. ed. Pusey VI. 302.

4. De Incarn. Unig. ed. Pusey. VII. 1. p.65.

5. Epist. III ad Nest. P.G. 76, 116.

6. Thesaurus 24. P.G. 75, 396.

7. Epist. ad Accacius. P.G. 77, 200.

8. De Rect. Fid. ad Reg. 1. ed. Pusey VII. 1. 249.

Here the adverb *σωματικῶς* means humanly generally, in body and soul. When Cyril speaks of the One Person of the Incarnate Logos he does not mean that the Logos united to himself only the properties of humanity but that He took real manhood. Christ took real and complete human nature which did not exist by itself before His Incarnation.¹ His theological language was not yet satisfactory. If it were, the whole doctrine of the two Natures would have been preserved from much confusion. However Cyril contributed to the final acceptance of the idea of the Unity in Christ, though he did not express it in a clear terminology.²

-
1. P. Trembelas. *Dogmatics* vol. II. 97, also R.A. Norris. *Manhood and Christ*, p.96.
 2. Grillmeier *op. c.* 405.

Chapter ThreeCommunicatio Idiomatum - Its Consequences

Concerning the so-called "Communicatio Idiomatum" Cyril rejects both conceptions, the Nestorian and the Monophysitic. The Nestorian idea is a simple moral transfer based on the mutual relations of two persons, therefore of two Christs. The monophysitic conception is a confusion of the two natures and therefore of the Idiomata. Finally Cyril asserts by Communicatio Idiomatum that the two natures are, as we have seen, inseparably united in the One Person,¹ not being confused² and that they both transfer and Communicate their properties, their Idiomata, to the One Person which is their centre,³ and in which they are united, and not to each other.⁴ Since each nature in Christ is perfect and not confused with the other and moreover since each nature Communicates properties to the One and the One and Same Person. There is not a new, third, nature. The human nature remains a human nature and the divine remains divine, but the human nature united hypostatically with the Divine receives gifts from the wealth of the perfections of the Deity, therefore the human nature of Christ is elevated as far as it is possible for human nature to be. The divine nature, being infinite and limitless, does not, receive anything from the limited human nature. The Divine nature is the giver while the human

-
1. Ep. IV ad Nest. P.G. 77, 45.
 2. Ibid.
 3. J. Quasten. Patrology. op. c. II 139.
 4. P. Trembelas Dogmatics. Vol. II'.

is the receiver. The human nature being created receives from the divine according to its own human measure of acceptability.¹

Now after this general remark we can examine Cyril's teaching about this question. Although the human nature of Christ by itself is not to be adored, it is nevertheless, adored because of its essential and inseparable union with the divine nature which alone by itself is to be adored. Therefore since there is only One Son² the adoration of the Logos cannot be separated from the adoration of human nature and so only one common adoration is to be offered to the Incarnate Logos.³ Cyril finds the above mentioned highest elevation of Christ's human nature even in His Human Knowledge, His Power, and His Holiness. With regard to Christ's Knowledge Cyril does not refuse a progressive human knowledge of Christ by experience. It should be accepted that "the child grew and waxed strong in spirit filled with wisdom and the grace of God was upon Him" have been said in so far human nature is concerned.⁴ This fact manifests the depth of Christ's economy - self-emptying - since He Himself as the eternal Logos was the whole Wisdom.⁵ "It was for this reason that He allowed the customs and the Laws of Humanity to apply to also to His Flesh. So He is said to increase in Wisdom, without accepting any addition of wisdom in so far as He is considered God, all-perfect in all things."⁶ He also speaks of a ἄμωτος Knowledge which Christ had

1. P. Trembelas. op. c. vol. II. 121.

2. Comment. in Ioan. IX, 37 ed. Pusey 200.

3. The idea of one adoration to Jesus Christ is found in New Testament, (Philip. 2, 10 Hebr. 1, 6. Revel. 5, 11.)

4. Comment. in Evang. Luke P.G. 72, 505.

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid.

because of His Immediate Communication with the Father,¹ because He, Himself was true God. As His human Knowledge increased and was illuminated, because of the hypostatic union, from the Divine Knowledge of Christ, Jesus Christ was free from any error.² Cyril also says that the human Knowledge of Christ had a gradual progress which certainly was not from outside. 'Η σὰρξ ἡ προχόπτουσα ἦν ἐν αὐτῷ ³ If sarx here means generally the human nature of Christ then the phrase σὰρξ προχόπτουσα manifests the development of His human Knowledge. This element of human Knowledge of Christ shows Cyril's understanding of the reality of Christ's complete human nature consisted of His body and His Soul. This teaching could be used as another argument against Apollinarius' teaching. This human nature of Christ was developed through the formation of general conceptions and through the formation of judgements, and thoughts.⁴ Now, how Christ's Divine and human Knowledge existed in the same Person and which their relation was is impossible for us to understand. It remains a great mystery. With regard to Christ's human power His Human nature except its own power was communicated in the divine Power because of the hypostatic Unity so was able to perform supernatural deeds, like the miracles or to work man's Salvation." Cyril says work Adversus Anthropomorphitas: "When He (Jesus Christ) forms the Divine deeds, you, without

-
1. Comment. in Isah. 8, 38. P.G. 73, 873.
 2. Androutsos, Dogmatics. p.181. We find the same idea in John.
 3. Comment in Luk. Evang. P.G. 72, 508.
Damascene" De Incarnat. Verbi. III. 21. P.G. 94, 1085.
 4. Congar Yves. Jesus Christ. Paris 1965. E.T. by L. O'Neill.
London 1966 p.51.

separating the Divine Logos from His Flesh, should understand that the only-begotten Logos of God, becoming man acted often through His own Flesh, which He had His own." διὰ τῆς ἰδέας αὐτοῦ σαρκὸς πολλάκις ἐνήργει ὡς ἰδέαν ἔχων αὐτήν .¹ Now, concerning Christ's holiness Cyril has no hesitation in saying that the sarx of Christ was Holy, not by itself but by the hypostatic Unity with the divine Logos. This hypostatic Union, therefore, and not His sinless Birth of Virgin Mary was, the cause of sinlessness of Christ's human nature.² Cyril expresses this teaching clearly. "He Himself being as God, the offering of sanctification to others, is sanctified with us in humanity, hence the grace and the sanctification of the flesh which is not holy by nature but becomes such by participation in God."³ The Sanctification of Christ's human nature had two aspects: firstly, positively the Χρῖστος of His Flesh.⁴ The divine through this chrisis offered to humanity sanctification. According to Cyril, Christ although had received the chrisis from the first moment of the Hypostatic Union in the Virgin's Mary's Womb, received also in His Baptism another special Anointing when the Holy Spirit came upon Him in order that He could fulfil His redemptive work,⁵ and, secondly, this sanctification negatively contained also the absolute sinlessness of Christ. Christ was sinless. Here we are facing the difficult question of the nature of Christ's sinlessness. Was His sinlessness anything external, depending on His Own Will? Therefore was Christ sinless because He did not want to sin though He could? (relative sinlessness), or was His

1. Adv. Anthropomorphitas 22, P.G. 76, 1117.

2. Androutsos op. c. p.185.

3. Comment. in Psalms. LXIV. P.G. 69, 1040.

4. Adoratio in Spirito 10. P.G. 68, 662.

5. Comment. in Psalmos 44. P.G. 69, 1040.

sinlessness His Own, inner, natural property? And can we say that Christ could not sin? (absolute sinlessness). The early Church Fathers had to fight against three different heretical teachings concerning Christ's sinlessness. Some heretics refused Divinity of Christ and with it they also refused His sinlessness. Some others like Nestorius refused the hypostatic Union of Christ, and with it therefore they refuse also His sinlessness. Others like Apollinarius wanted to accept Christ's Sinlessness and that is why they thought that they ^{had} to destroy His human nature which, according to their teaching, was the cause of sin. The Fathers' answer that by accepting Mind and Soul in Christ we do not accept "any possibility to sin" in Christ because these Mind and Soul and Will do not constitute a special and separate Person but they are Mind and Soul of the One Theanthropic Person. This is true since as we have seen, this Hypostatic Union is the cause of Christ's absolute sinlessness. Cyril speaks clearly about Christ's absolute Sinlessness, or to use the known terms, He speaks of "non potui peccare" in Christ because of the Hypostatic Union". Those, who think that it was possible for Christ to sin because He became like us by self-emptying and received the form of a servant and was among men, are unwise.

As in Adam we have been condemned because of his disobedience and the transgression of the Command, thus have we been justified because of the very (or absolute) sinlessness and the sinless obedience (of Christ) who assumed human nature while He was sinless".¹ Here Cyril speaks of Christ's absolute Sinlessness in a way that cannot be misunderstood. The possibility

¹. Contra Anthropomorphitas. 23. P.G. 76, 1120-

of Christ's humanity to sin would mean possibility of Christ Himself to sin since His Person is the bearer of this humanity and therefore every movement of His human nature is controlled and directed by this theanthropic Person and Christ's human Will was therefore identified with Goodness and had no relation with sin at all. This power of doing evil is not human perfection but weakness of the Will.

Cyril goes on reminding us that Christ, though He was sinless, was nevertheless tempted. His temptations were real, assailed Him only externally without contaminating Him, without causing Him to sin.¹ On the contrary these passions trying to tempt our Lord were beaten by Him and destroyed by the Logos. Neither could any irritation from His inner Nature lead Him to sin, nor could His human Will, being externally irritated, turn towards good or evil. His Humanity, fighting against temptation, was strengthened by the United Divine nature.² It was in His human nature that Christ fought against Satan. Cyril expresses this idea in his important work *De Incarn. Domini*. "If the nature assumed (by Christ) had not had human mind it would have been only God who would have fought against Satan, and who would have won. But had God Himself won, then I would not have gained anything not having offered anything to it, but I would have also been deprived of any joy since I would have been proud of others' victories. Satan would boast as being defeated by God having wrestled with God."³ This passage is of great theological significance. Christ in His Humanity fought against Satan. The superiority of Christ's humanity over Satan's power is obvious here. Cyril speaking of the Lord's temptations refers to the

1. Thesaurus 24. P.G. 75, 397.

2. P. Trembelas, op. c. 137.

3. *De Incarn. Unig.* 15. 75, 1444.

so-called sinless passions -ἀδιάβλητα πάθη - of the Lord, namely all the weaknesses of His Flesh, which are not sins, and which were roused in Him, so that they might be abolished through Him and that our nature turn towards perfection. "You will find in Christ the (sinless) passions of flesh being in movement, not so that they may conquer (Him) as they do in us, but so that they, being defeated, be abolished through the power of the Logos dwelt in Flesh".¹ After all that we have said we can say that in Cyril's Christology we have an important synthesis of two elements. Cyril's christology is based on two poles, on Christ as the Eternal Logos of God, as God the Son on the one hand and on the historical Person Jesus Christ the Incarnate Logos, who was born, lived, taught, acted, and suffered at a concrete period of time on earth for men's salvation.² Cyril does not separate these two aspects at all. If Christ were not the eternal Logos of God, real God, He could not have the power for man's Salvation and if Christ had not become Flesh, men would not have been saved since the human nature would not have been assumed by the Logos in order to be sanctified and deified. The Incarnation of the Logos was the greatest event of history and created a meeting point between two worlds. The historic Christ had the authority to do what He did because He was at the same time, the eternal Logos, He was the Incarnate Logos. This christological Synthesis is to be understood only through the very fact of the Incarnation. This conclusion leads me to another. In Cyril's Theology we

1. C. Anthropomorphitas 24, P.G. 75, 397.

2. Comment. in Evang. Joannii 11, 33 P.G. 74, 53.

have an important combination between God's being and God's acting. In combining these two ideas Cyril does not destroy either God's being or His acting. God remains what He is. Christ was the real God. God's acting is to be understood in terms of God's acting for man's Salvation. As we have seen, Cyril always brings together these two aspects of Theology. He never separates them, and therefore Cyril always presents to us what the eternal God is in His acts towards us in Jesus Christ. For Cyril christology means the doctrine of Christ's Person as He is understood as man's Saviour.

Chapter Four

The Conception of Enhypostasis

In Christian Christology the doctrine of "Enhypostasis" is of great theological significance. This term "enhypostatos" means neither an "anhypostatos" namely a non-existing thing, nor a self-existing hypostasis. It means a real nature which exists only in and by something else. Leontius of Byzantium used this term for the first time in this important sense.¹ This term was used even before Leontius but it was He who used it in its best sense. This doctrine of "Enhypostasis" explains the great mystery of the One Hypostasis in Christ. The human nature, being complete, is not an hypostasis by itself, namely it is not a separate person, self-existing but it is an "Enhypostatos", i.e. it is a perfect nature which does not exist by itself but only in and by the Divine Hypostasis of the Logos. This teaching about Christ's human nature being an "Enhypostatos" fights both against Nestorius' teaching of Two Persons in Christ and against Monophysitis' teaching of only one perfect nature in Christ. It is also against Apollinarius' teaching of Christ's imperfect human nature.²

The meaning of this term is found in Cyril's Christology because he had to insist in teaching that the Body which was united with the Only-begotten was His Own Body and not of anybody else's. Τοῦ Μονογενοῦς Ἰδίου ἦν καὶ οὐχ ἑτέρου τὸ σῶμα.³ Here we have the idea of Enhypostatos though the term itself is not used. Again and again he comes

1. P.G. 86/1, 1277, cf. Andreas Theodorou. "The christological terminology of Leontius of Byzantium", in periodical "Theologia" Vol. 26. p.215-216. ATHENS

2. An Theodorou c. op. 217.

3. Ad. Nestorius I'. P.G. 76, 20.

to the same idea: Christ is truly God and He is One. "He is not understood separately into a man and into a god but He is the One Who is both the Logos of God the Father and man born of a woman, and has become man, like us, along with His being God".¹

The human nature of Christ is neither a separate hypostasis nor a non-existing nature but a real nature existing in and by the Divine hypostasis of the Logos, it is "Enhypostatos".

The Incarnate Logos in His relation to the Holy Trinity.

Since the eternal Logos remains God after His Incarnation, the relation between the Logos and the Father and the Holy Spirit has not been destroyed; it remains a relation between the three Persons of the Holy Trinity. For this reason Cyril says that "by accepting the Son truly as Son we will arrive also at the Knowledge of God the Father.... A knowledge of the Son is concurrent with belief in the Father"² and "the Son in Nature and essence remains the Image of God the Father and not a Being moulded merely into His likeness by attributes bestowed Himself, being by nature something essentially different".³ Cyril insists in teaching that through the Son we receive the Knowledge not only of the Father but of the whole Deity, therefore of the Holy Spirit, too.⁴ Here we have the same relation between all Persons of the Holy Trinity before and after the Incarnation of the Logos since this

1. Ad. Nestor. I P.G. 76, 24.

2. Comment. in Evang. Ioan. 14, 6. P.G. 74, 192.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.

Incarnation does not mean change of Divinity of the Logos. The Son with the Father after the Incarnation is the συγχρηγός of the Spirit.¹ When we have to use the two verbs-terms συγχρηγεῖν to co-offer and προέρχεσθαι to proceed we apply the second one to the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father while the first one refers to the sending of the Holy Spirit to the World through Christ in time. Therefore, the dogma of the Holy Trinity is not destroyed because of the Incarnation of the Logos. The Holy Trinity remains Trinity because the Son being true God after His Incarnation, has not lost His inner natural and Substantial Union with the Father and the Spirit.

The Hypostatic Union and the work of man's Salvation.

Cyril was sure that the Nestorian Christology destroyed the whole conception of man's Salvation. If man's redemption was to be a real reconciliation between God and man, it could be realized only by God, and if Jesus Christ were not perfect God His actions could not be divine and therefore saving actions. According to Cyril man's Salvation is real and true because Jesus Christ is the eternal and Incarnate Logos, whole both Natures are perfect.² "If Christ were not God by nature but a mere man or a sign of God then we are by no means saved by God but by

1. De Rect. Fid. ad Theod. 37, P.G. 76, 1189.

2. Ad. Nestor. P.G. 77, 121.

one other man who through foreign power has saved us".¹ But who else could have such a saving power? In this case the saving Blood of Christ would be like the blood of any other man. If He were really God in flesh then He could by His Blood save the whole world.² That is why Cyril insists in teaching again and again that it was the Blood of the Incarnate Logos which saved us.³ Speaking of Christ's Blood Cyril directly speaks of the Hypostatic Union in Christ because this Blood, was the Blood of the Incarnate Logos, the Blood of God after He assumed His Human nature. It was His own Blood which was shed on the Cross where He offered Himself as a ransom for all people.⁴ Because through the Incarnation the Blood of His human nature was His own Blood, that is why this Blood was saving Blood, Blood of God. The Hypostatic Union and this human nature were therefore necessary for man's Salvation.⁵ We shall see this teaching of Cyril again in next pages and we shall examine it in detail.

-
1. Ad Monach. P.G. 77, 37.
 2. De Rect. Fid. P.G. 76, 1292.
 3. Ibid. P.G. 76, 1296.
 4. Ibid. P.G. 76, 1296.
 5. Comment. in Psalmos. 90. P.G. 69, 1217.

Chapter Five

The Virgin Mary truly Theotokos

Speaking of the Incarnation of the Logos Cyril had to refer to the Virgin¹ Mary who was used by God as the Instrument in the work of that great mystery, namely the Incarnation. Thus the doctrine of the Virgin Mary is so important and necessary for Cyril in his Christology. Mary is considered as a real Mother since She gave birth to Her Child and in particular, Mother of the Theanthropos since Her Child was the Incarnate Logos of God.² Therefore, the Virgin Mary, the Mother of the Incarnate Logos, the Mother of God is really Theotokos. The establishment of this title for the Virgin Mary was one of the greatest dogmatic victories won by Cyril. This belief is necessary for a correct and an unslandered confession of our faith, because She gave birth not to Deity only but to the Logos of God who was united with Flesh".³ For that reason this belief was contained in the first Anathematismus against Nestorius.⁴ She was not a Goddess but a human Person who, gave birth to the Incarnate Logos.⁵ This birth took place παραδδξως⁶ and not according to human laws because the Child born of the Virgin was God. His birth however does not mean that the Logos received His first existence as Logos through Mary.⁷ However the Son of Mary was not a simple or a common man⁸ because

-
1. C. Dratsellas. Theotokos and the Akathistos Hymn. Athens 1957.
 2. Ad. Eberle. Die Mariologie des Heil. Kyrillusv. Alex. Freiburg 1914 p. 74.
 3. Homil. 15. P.G. 77, 1093B' Ἀρχεῖ...πρὸς ὀρθήν...τῆς πίστεως ὁμολογίαν τὸ
 4. Epist. 17. ad. Nestor. P.G. 77, 1203/θεοτόκον λέγειν...τὴν Ἁγίαν Παρθένον"
 5. Adv. Nestor. 1. P.G. 76, 57.
 6. Hom. 15. P.G. 77, 1093.
 7. Ep. 4 ad Nest. P.G. 77, 45 - Adv. Nest. II'. P.G. 76, 96
 8. Ep. 17 ad Nest. P.G. 77, 109 - Ep. 4. ad Nest. p.G. 77, 41
De Recta Fid. ad Theod. P.G. 76, 1152 -

the Logos from Virgin Mary's Womb had undertaken human birth and had made the Flesh His Own Flesh and even in His Mother's Womb He was God.¹ According to Cyril the only-begotten Son of God being as the eternal Logos, of the same Substance with His Father has received Flesh and become man as well from His Mother². His humanity being of the same substance with ours without sin. The Logos of God was born of Mary and therefore She who gave birth to Him is to be called Theotokos.³ In Her Womb the Unity of the two natures of the Incarnate Logos took place, and that is why Mary has a great place in Cyril's Christology against either Nestorianism or Monophysitism. If Mary's Son is God, the denial of the title Theotokos to His Mother means refusal of the Divinity of Christ.⁴ Cyril knows that the term "Theotokos", is not found in the Holy Bible.⁵ However, the full content and meaning of this word is clearly found in the Scriptures. Mary is really Theotokas if Her Son is true God⁶ and the Bible's teaching concerning this idea is clear.⁷ Cyril brings Biblical witnesses to show that Christ is true God⁸ and that He is One Person in two natures.⁹ This point was fundamental in Cyril's controversy with Nestorius and Monophysitism. If Maria is only Anthropotokos then we have to admit two persons in Christ. In this case we are to destroy the

-
1. Adv. Nest. III' P.G. 76, 156.
 2. Ep. 17 ad Nest. P.G. 77, 109
 3. Hom. Paschal. 17 P.G. 77, 777.
 4. Quod unus sit Christus P.G. 75, 1273 - Ep. 16 ad Juvenal. P.G. 77, 104.
 5. Ep. ad. Monach. Agypt. P.G. 77, 13.
 6. Quod unus Christus P.G. 77, 1276.
 7. De Incarn. Unig. P.G. 75, 1400 - De Rect. Fid. ad Reg. P.G. 76, 1204.
 8. Hom. Pasch. 17. P.G. 77, 776.
 9. Ep. 45 ad Succesus. P.G. 77, 229.

whole doctrine of the two natures of Christ. That is why Cyril teaches that there is only One Christ, One Incarnate Logos born of the Virgin Mary.¹ The Divine Logos does not exist in Christ as in the prophets, but He Himself has become true Man.² He Himself has assumed perfect human nature through the Virgin Mary. It is for this great reason that the Christian Church has always had a special veneration to the ever-Virgin Mary. Her ever-Virginity was not spoilt by the Birth of Her Divine Son because His Birth took place mysteriously, supernaturally and by the Divine Grace.³ The place of Theotokos in Cyril's Theology and particularly in the doctrine of the Incarnation is important.

1. Ep. 45 ad Succesus. P.G. 77, 229.

2. De Incarn. Unig. P.G. 75, 1394.

3. C. Dratsellas op. c. 32 (where the whole question is discussed)

Chapter SixCyril's Christology in its relation to: I Apollinarianism.II Nestorianism and III Monophysitism.

After what has been said, there can be no doubt that Cyril cannot be accused of either Apollinarianism or Nestorianism, or Monophysitism.

(I') Following the platonic understanding of man as consisting of three elements, irrational Soul, Spirit and Body,¹ Apollinarius taught that the Logos becoming incarnate received Human Body and Irrational Soul, without any spirit which was replaced by the Logos Himself. Apollinarius wanted to lay stress on the Unity of the Thanthropic Person of Christ and on His sinlessness. And believing that physis and Person are inseparable² and he who accepts two complete physeis in Christ accepts two Persons as well, Apollinarius said that in Christ there are not two physeis but one Physis and one Person incarnate.³ (Trembelas P. op. c. II 74, Quasten op. c. III' 140). But Cyril repudiated these Apollinarian teachings strongly by teaching that the Incarnate Logos received Flesh not without a rational Soul, therefore a perfect physically human nature was born truly of a woman and became Man, He who is co-eternal with God the Father, and Who is perfect in Humanity as He is perfect in Deity.... He is One and the same out of two perfect". (De Incarn. Unig. 7. P.G. 75, 1220) Cyril accepted also the Communicatio Idiomatum as a Union of the Two Natures.

II'. Nestorius, a pupil of Theodore of Uopsuestia, denied the hypostatic Union of the Two Natures. Following the Aristotelic teaching that there is a Person where there is a real Physis, accepted that the Human nature of

-
1. Nemesius, of Emesa (4' century), about the Nature of Man, P.G. 40,504.A'
 2. Stephanides B., Ecclesiastical History, Athens 1948. p.191.
 3. His Confession of Faith to Emperor Jovianum. (363-364).

Christ is a particular Person with its own hypostosis and does not depend naturally on the Hypostasis of the Logos. Therefore, the Union of the two Natures in Christ was not natural or hypostatic but, only moral or through a mingling. There are two persons which come together to a moral Person and not the Person of the Logos which received the human nature. This Person was only a phenomenical and plasmatic Person.¹ Now, attacking Nestorius' teaching Cyril points out that it was not the Man who first was born as a common man and to whom later the Logos came.² But the Logos without changing in flesh, united in Himself, hypostatically and unspeakably from the Womb, flesh inamated with rational soul and became Man not by will alone. The difference of the two natures was not destroyed because of the Union, but these two constituted the One Lord and Christ. (ibid). "The Logos became Son of Man while being what He was, namely God, so that the same is perfect both in Deity and in Humanity, while He is One Person".³ (see letters and fragments of Nestorius in Loofs' Nestoriana, Halle, 1910).

(III'). Teaching against Nestorius Eutyches went to the opposite extreme and characterized the Union of the two Natures conjunction in which the human nature was absorbed by the divine. He accepted one hypostasis and one Person in the Logos but insisted that after the Union there was in Him only One Physis as well.⁴

Speaking of Christ as "being perfect both in Deity and perfect in

-
1. Andreas Theodorou. The Christological teaching of and terminology of Cyril of Alexandria and Theodoret of Cyrus. Athens 1955. p.28).
 2. Epist. 4 ad Nest. P.G. 75, 45.
 3. Adv. Nest. blasphem. II. 6 P.G. 76, 85.
 4. Mansi J.D. Scriptorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio. Florence 1759-1798 (reprint and Contin. Paris and Leipzig 1901-1927), VI, 741-744.

humanity while being One Person"¹. Cyril teaches against Monophysitism. He distinguishes clearly the two natures of Jesus Christ Who is One Person. Cyril taught that after the Incarnation the Logos had, as before it, One Physis.² But Cyril did not teach Monophysitism. As an opponent to Apollinarius Cyril did not wish to mix the human nature with the divine in Christ, (Harnack. op. c. IV 178) and spoke of the Union of the Logos with a human perfect nature which however does not subsist independently in itself but in the Logos, as we have seen.³

Therefore, not only can not Cyril be accused of either Apollinarianism or Nestorianism or Monophysitism but one has to admit that he was the great defender of the true Christological doctrine, against all those heresies. Later, the D'Ecumenical Synod in Chalcedon (451) officially defined the doctrine of the Union of the Two Natures in Christ. Thus against Apollinarius it said that "Christ is perfect both in Deity and in Humanity, and against Nestorius and Monophysitism it said that "the Thanthropos was born of Mary the Theotokos, and there is only One Lord Jesus Christ, who is recognized in two Natures but in One Person".⁴

-
1. De Incarn. Unig. P.G. 75, 1220.
 2. 40 Ep. ad. Accacius. P.G. 77, 192.
 3. Quasten op. c. III 140.
 4. Mansi. ibid. VII, 116.

Third Section

Jesus Christ our Mediator and Saviour

Chapter One

Christ's Mediatorship

I' Essence of Christ's Mediatorship.

Some of the Old testament people were called mediators between God and man.¹ There is no doubt that Christ is the unique Mediator whose mediatorship has a special character since Christ's goal was the real reconciliation of sinful man with sinless God, since He destroyed the power of Satan, forgave man's sin and offered to him again the Divine Grace for a new life in God.² Christ was able to do so as Theanthropos, as God of the same Substance with the Father and as Man of the same substance with us.³ Thus He was the Bridge between Deity and manhood, and the Mediator between God and man, as the unique meeting place between Deity and Humanity.⁴ It was through this fact that mankind was able to receive Grace and the blessings of the Holy Spirit. Cyril expresses this idea again and again. In his Commentary, for instance, on St. John, Cyril says: "He (Christ) is Mediator between God and men; according as it is written, Knit unto God the Father naturally as God and of Him, and again unto men as man; and withal having in Himself the Father and being Himself in the Father. For He is the impress and effulgence of His person and not distinct from the Essence, whereof He is impress and where from He

1. Thesaurus 32, P.G. 75, 504.

2. De Trinit. 1. P.G. 75, 692.

3. Thesaurus 32, P.G. 75, 504.

4. De Trinit. Dialog. 3. P.G. 75, 853. "Μεθόριον Θεότητος καὶ ἀνθρωπότητος"

procedes as effulgence, but both being Himself in it and having it in Himself, and again having us in Himself according as He wears our nature and our body has become entitled to the Body of the Word. For the Word was made flesh and He wears our nature, remoulding it into His own life. And He is also Himself in us; for we have all been made partakers of Him and have Him in ourselves through the spirit, for, for this reason we have both been made partakers of the Divine nature and are entitled sons, after this sort, having in us also the Father Himself through the Son. And Paul will testify hereof where he says: Because ye are sons God sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, saying Abba the Father".¹

In this passage Cyril clearly speaks of a twofold mediatorship of Christ, one natural and one spiritual. These two together contain the whole meaning of Christ's Mediatorship. According to the natural, as we have said, Christ is the link between men and God naturally, in Himself. According to the second, Christ unites man and God because He makes man partaker of Grace and Holy Spirit. He makes men sons of God the Father, because "no man will come to the Father, i.e. will appear as a partaker of the divine Nature, save through Christ alone. For if He had not become a Mediator by taking human form, our condition could never have advanced to such a height of blessedness; but now, if any one approaches the Father in a spirit of faith and reverent Knowledge he will do so, by the help of our Saviour - Christ Himself".² Christ being true God was able to lift up human nature³ and to endure all the human weaknesses which are not sinful⁴ and to effect man's salvation; this means that Christ is

1. Com. in Ioan. 14, 20. P.G. 74, 280 (E.T. Library of the Fathers by members of the English Church. London 1885, p.320).

2. Com. in Joan. 14, 5 P.G. 192 (E.T. op. c. p.243)

3. Paschal. letter 17. P.G. 77, 776.

4. De rect. Fid. ad Reg. 11, 37. P.G. 76, 1385.

not simply an outward helper but a real Mediator naturally related with humankind.¹ Therefore, there is no doubt that Christ's Mediatorship can be based only on the fact of the Incarnation. "If we say that the Logos has not become flesh, i.e. that He has not endured birth in flesh from a Woman, we destroy the mystery of God's *Economia*.² Since Christ is able to reconcile and unite man and God, apparently He does it mainly not in a magical way, nor in a theory, but really, by his sacerdotal function, because it was only through His unique sacrifice that man was reconciled to God. Cyril speaks of the sacred character of Christ's Mediatorship in passages like the following: "Since He is a high Priest, in so much as He is man and at the same time brought Himself as a blameless sacrifice to God the Father, as a ransom for the life of all men, being as it were first fruits of mortality that in all things He might have the pre-eminence, as St. Paul says; and He reconciles to Him the reprobate race of man upon the earth, purifying them by His Own Blood, and shaping them to newness of life through the holy spirit; and since all things are accomplished by the Father through the Son in the Spirit; He moulds the prayer for blessings towards us, as Mediator and High Priest, though He unites with His Father in giving and providing Divine and spiritual graces".³ We should not forget that Cyril speaks of three Offices those of Prophet, Priest and King, of *king* as we shall see later, and unites them with His Mediatorship. Speaking of Christ's Mediatorship as the way for man's salvation Cyril connects this goal with another important and fundamental goal, the manifestation of God's glory. "Truly He had been glorified in

1. Com. in Joan. 8, 29. P.G. 73, 844.

2. Quod unus sit Christus, P.G. 75, 1268.

3. Com. in Ioan. 17, 2. P.G. 74, 480 (E.T. op. c. 483-4)

other ways and had won for Himself most distinctly a reputation for possessing Divine authority: still the perfect consummation of His glory and the fulness of His fame were summed up in the facts of His sufferings for the life of the world and opening by His own Resurrection the gate through which all may rise".¹ The two goals are inseparable for Cyril. Through all God's miraculous acts² His glory was really manifested and man's Salvation was realized and fulfilled.

When Cyril speaks of God's glory he certainly means ~~both~~ the glory of the Son, the Incarnate Logos, and the glory of the Father and the glory of the Holy Spirit. "With Christ in His glorification, God the Father also is greatly glorified, not as receiving from His off-spring any addition of glory....., but because it is made known of what a Son He is the Father. For even, as it is a pride and a glory to the Son to have such a Being for His Father, likewise, also it is a pride and a glory even to the Father to have born from Himself so glorious a Son".³ The whole Trinity was co-operating in the work of the Incarnation of the Son, as we have said, and therefore the Whole Trinity is participate in Glory. Here we have a new important characteristic of Cyril's Theology, namely his doxological understanding of Theology. Cyril's Theology is basically doxological. He sees God's glory in the goal of the whole creation and particularly in man's creation, in the Incarnation of the Logos and in the great work of Salvation. In the completion of man's Salvation in the eternal world. This doxology belongs to the whole Trinity. His doxological theology is to be understood

¹. In Ioan. 13, 31. P.G. 74, 153 (E.T. op. c. 209-10).

². De Rect. Fid. ad Reg. ii. 36. P.G. 76, 1384 (Com. in Isai-25, 1. P.G. 70, 556).

³. Com. in Ioan. 13, 31. P.G. 74, 153. (E.T. c. op. 211).

only in terms of a trinitarian theology. Speaking of Christ's Mediatorship to sinful mankind which needs forgiveness and salvation Cyril characterizes Christ as "the centre of the whole Universe. "The whole visible and invisible creation is participating in Christ. Because Angels and even those Cherubim are not holy save only through Christ in the Holy Spirit".¹ So Christ becomes the centre not only of men, and the foundation of their restoration but also the centre of the whole Creation.²

II' Efficacy of Christ's Mediatorship

In discussing Christ's being the second root and the new beginning of mankind Cyril faces serious questions. How is Christ our root? Is He so in a moral way which means that He through His prayer and His obedience has asked His Father to send His grace upon men? Or is He our root in a natural way, which means that Christ is the cause of man's Salvation, just as the vine stems give its power to its branches? Cyril approaches and answers these questions only in the right way. Cyril affects not only morally but also naturally: His Humanity is not only the result but also the cause of our salvation.³ Cyril expresses this idea when he says Christ healed Peter's Mother in Law by simply touching her with His hand.⁴ His Body had this healing power because it was united with His Deity.⁵ Cyril says again and again, as we have seen, that Christ's humanity did all the miracles naturally in a sense which we have already explained in a special chapter. It was because of the true union with Christ's Deity that His

1. Glaphyra in Levitic. P.G. 69-549.

2. Weigle, op. c. 81.

3. Ibid. Luk 64.

4. Com. in Luk. 4, 38. P.G. 72, 549.

5. Ibid 5,38. P.G. 72, 551.

Body was life-giver or grace-giver.¹ When Cyril tries to explain this natural efficacy of Christ, he says that "in Christ God the Father has reformed the whole human nature to its original state"² since Christ by becoming man had in Himself the whole of human nature³ and because Christ had our nature in Himself. His Body is called our body⁴ but neither in the sense that Christ had human nature only in general nor in the platonic sense of ideas and the ideal world.⁵ On the contrary Weigl points out that a little moderate Aristotelian realism could be found in Cyril's theology⁶ concerning our question. Cyril says that "Christ as the real beginning of mankind has prepared and made our salvation real for all men in and through Himself, because He has assumed human nature in Himself and has sanctified it and is, as we have said, the vine and men are the branches"⁷. All the members of the tree of mankind constitute one whole in relation to Christ. No doubt Cyril speaks of the mystical Union of Christ with His Church, since in His Church all the baptized members have received the One Spirit of Christ through Baptism and receive the One Body of Christ through the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist.⁸ This happens because Christ called all mankind to salvation and because Christ keeps His Church United to Himself.⁹ Even in this mystical union Christ acts as in the case of the natural union.¹⁰

-
1. De Incarn. Unig. P.G. 75, 1241.
 2. De Adoratio. 1, 8. P.G. 68, 552.
 3. Com. in Ioan. (a) 7, 39. P.G. 73, 753.
 4. Com. in Ioan. 14, 30. P.G. 74, 280.
 5. Apolog. ad. c. Julian. 1, 2. P.G. 76, 573.
 6. op. c. p.68 - Dialog. de Trinit. P.G. 75, 700.
 7. Thesaurus 15. P.G. 75, 289.
 8. Weigl, op. c. p.73.
 9. Glaphyra in Genes. 1, 1. P.G. 69, 29.
 10. Glaphyra in Numb. P.G. 69, 624.

III' Christ's Mediatorship in Heaven

Cyril is sure that even after His Cross and Resurrection and even eternally in Heaven Christ does not cease the functions of His Mediatorship to His Father for all together and for each one of His believing people. This Mediatorship does not mean that Christ's work on the Cross was not perfect. On the contrary Christ's ascending into the Heaven was the result of His perfect sacrifice and His heavenly mediatorship is necessary because His believers here on earth are weak and in need, every moment, of Divine Grace and help.¹ We cannot know exactly how Christ acts as the eternal Mediator. We could however that Jesus Christ asks His Father for each one and for all His people on earth. His eternal Mediatorship is a real prayer of Christ who wants all gifts of His cross to be applied to His people.² Jesus Christ is the High Priest and will remain as such since His humanity, perfect and incorruptible after His Resurrection will remain united with the eternal Logos in Heaven. His heavenly Mediatorship will cease only with the end of this world and the beginning of the eternal world when His work on earth will have been completed and finished. But even after that Christ as the High with His people will be offering the eternal Hymn to God the Father while He as God will be accepting this Hymn.

1. Com. In Ioan. 17, 16. P.G. 74, 553.

2. Androntsos op. c. 205 - Letter to the Hebr. 7, 25-9, 24-Rom. 8, 34.
I' John, 2, 1.

Chapter TwoChrist as the Second Adam

When Cyril discusses the question of the relation of the Incarnate Logos to Adam and to the whole of mankind, he characterizes Christ as second Adam.¹ And in comparing Adam and Christ Cyril finds some similarities and also basic differences between them.

Similarity between Adam and Christ

Cyril justifies what he says by pointing out that both the first and the second Adam have a common characteristic, they both were roots and beginnings of mankind, though each one in a very different way. Cyril uses the same verbs παραπέμπειν,² διαβαίνειν³ διήκειν,⁴ τρέχειν⁵ to speak of the transition of the corrupted nature of Adam to all men, as well as of the transition of the holy nature of Christ to all those who have Him as the root of their real life, and being and who therefore receive all good things that are His own. ὅσα ἐν Χριστῷ ταῦτα καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς ."⁶ And as Adam was the "first root" and "origin" of all those who from him and the first nature father by bequeathing his nature with its characteristics to all his descendants by natural birth,⁷ so is Christ the second Adam because He is the Origin and the Root of a new Creation. Creation is now through Him new and transformed "ἀπαρχὴ τῆς ἀναμορφουμένης κτίσεως".⁸

1. Pasch. Hom. 28. P.G. 77, 941.

2. Com. in Lukas 5, 5. P.G. 72, 985.

3. De Incarn. Unig. 1. P.G. 75, 1372.

4. Com. in Ioan. 17, 18. P.G. 74, 548.

5. Com. in Ioan. 7, 39. P.G. 73, 793.

6. Thesaurus 20, P.G. 79, 333.

7. Weigl. Die Heilslehre des hl. Kyril v. Alexandrien. Mainz 1905. p.58.

8. De Incarn. Unig. P.G. 75, 1237.

He is the second root of mankind " ῥίζα δευτέρα τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος"¹ and the Origin of those who are sanctified in Him and through Him² and of those who have their salvation in Christ,³ and who obtain their real being and true existence and life in Christ " ἐν Χριστῷ ἔσμεν "⁴, which means that without this second and real root the tree of mankind cannot live, cannot be what it should be. In Christ man becomes real and perfect man. The second Adam has taken the place which the first Adam lost by his fall.⁵ Cyril calls Christ Son of Adam⁶ in the sense that Christ in His perfect humanity was a descendant of Adam. On the other hand Cyril calls the first Adam τύπος of the second Adam. Christ as eternal God existed even before the creation of the first Adam and the mystery of the Incarnation was eternally in the Plan of God.⁷ Since the first Adam was only the types of the second, Christ the fulfilment of the types, the reality. Therefore Adam is to be understood and interpreted only in Christ. This shows that man is more closely and truly related to Christ than to Adam, since man becomes the sanctified relation of a sanctified and holy nature⁸ and thus man belongs more to Christ than to Adam. Although Christ as God existed before Adam however appeared as Saviour of mankind on earth after Adam.⁹ That is why Adam is called types of the future¹⁰ which means that while Adam is only the "types" of Christ, Christ cannot be called types of Adam because Christ is the reality. This Adam, the types, is to be fulfilled only in Christ.

1. Pasch. Hom. 28. P.G. 77, 941.

2. Com. in Isa. 8, 3. P.G. 77, 941.

3. De Adoratio. 10 P.G. 68, 704.

4. Ibid. Ibid.

4. Com. in Matth. 1.1, P.G. 72, 365 - In Ioan. 1, 32. P.G. 73, 205.

6. Com. in Hebr. 2, 14. P.G. 74, 965.

7. Com. in Rom. 5, 14. P.G. 74, 785-

8. Adoratio 10, P.G. 68, 704.

9. Com. in Rom. 5, 14. P.G. 74, 785. 10. Adorat. 10. P.G. 68, 704.

Differences between Adam and Christ

When Cyril speaks of Adam and Christ in terms of their being "roots" and origins each in a different way and in a different sense, he points out clearly that these two "roots" must be absolutely distinguished from each other. Cyril speaks of fundamental and essential differences between them, between the first and the second Adam. These differences can be considered as referring, (1) to the nature of them both and (2) to their relations with mankind.

Differences with regard to themselves and their natures.

(a) The first Adam was a creature of God and had received his life and existence from God. The second Adam, Christ is God Himself and the giver of life to all other creatures¹ even to the first Adam since "all things were made by Him".² Christ had His power from Himself while Adam was given his power by God,³ i.e. by Christ the Eternal Logos of God.

(b) The first Adam was *Χοῦρός*.⁴ This body was made from the earth and therefore it was corruptible. The Second Adam is *Ἐπουράνιος*⁵ since He came from Heaven⁶ upon earth, He came *ἄνωθεν*⁷ and was not created but

1. De Rect. Fid. ad Reg. 12, P.G. 76, 1281.

2. John 1,

3. Weigl. op. c. 55.

4. Adv. Nest. III. P.G. 76, 141.

5. Thesaurus 13. P.G. 75, 232.

6. Com. on I Cor. 15, 44. P.G. 74, 909.

7. Adv. Nest. III P.G. 76, 141.

had His eternal existence from Himself being God.

(c) As we have seen, Adam was not perfect, was made relatively sinless in the sense that all possibilities and the abilities were given to him to perfect himself with the grace of God. Thus sin was not impossible for him.¹ On the contrary the second Adam, Christ, was absolutely sinless² and sin not possible for Him.³ His human nature because of the hypostatic Union with the divine nature was perfect.⁴ Cyril expresses these ideas very often. "Which was the first picture of the forefather(first Adam) that fell to sin, and was under death and corruption. And which is the picture of the heavenly One? That He was not defeated by any passion and that He did not know sin and was not subjected to death and corruption. Sanctification, Justice and all that are similar to those (were the picture of the heavenly One)".⁵ In this passage Cyril presents fundamental and essential differences between the first and the second Adam.

(d) Cyril finds a basic difference between the two Adams when he characterizes the first one as the Adam of disobedience to God while Christ was the Adam of Obedience to His Father.⁶ Cyril characterizes Christ's obedience as perfect, holy and sinless obedience. "Ὑπακοή εἰς ἅπαν καὶ ἀμώμητος".⁷ Christ's Obedience was voluntary and free, since He was Incarnate and suffered for man's salvation not without His personal Will, but willingly. His Will was in absolute agreement with the Will

1. See the special chapter of this thesis on this question.

2. Com. in Hebr. 5, 14. P.G. 74, 965. "ὁ Λόγος θεῶς εἰδώς ἁμαρτίαν"

3. Adoratio 9, P.G. 68, 593. "ὁ Χριστός ἄτρωτος ἁμαρτίας καὶ ὅπως ἅγιος"

4. Com. in I. Cor. 15, 45. P.G. 74, 909.

5. C. Nest. III. P.G. 76, 129.

6. Hom. Divers. 10, P.G. 77, 1020. "ἐξώσθη μὲν ἐκεῖνος τοῦ παραδελσίου διὰ τὴν ἀπει-

7. C. Anthropomorph. 23. P.G. 76, 1120. "θεῖαν, εἰσεέλθετε ὑμεῖς διὰ τῆς εὐπειθείας"

of His Father. " ' Υπέρ τῆς ἀπάντων ζωῆς ἐθελοντῆς ἀνατλάς τὸν θάνατον" ¹

Differences with regard to their relations to mankind

Between the first and the second Adam there are not only differences concerning their natures. Cyril sees some basic differences in their relations with the whole of mankind. Our relation to Adam is to be understood only in the light of our relation to Christ. Therefore our relations to each of the two Adams cannot be of the same significance. Cyril says again and again: like that χοῖλός Αδάμ all those who come from him are χοῖλοι and like the οὐράνιος . Adam, Christ, all those who come after Him become οὐράνιοι ² and πνευματικοί . Christians become Γένος of the heavenly Adam ³ and thus they become new and spiritual people. As Adam was the origin of the old dough, so was Christ the beginning of the new dough, of the New Life, ⁴ and so He became the origin of the New Creation of the New man, and of all things which become new. " Καινή κτίσις καὶ οἶονεὶ καιρῶν καὶ πραγμάτων βλάστη νέα τῶν ἐν Χριστῷ " ⁵

Here Cyril speaks of a new state, of a New Time, of a Time which has been redeemed in Christ who thus has become the starting-point of a new holy period, History. In this new Time the Creation becomes new because Christ transforms it. ⁶ Everything becomes new in Christ. So Christ is the arche-

-
1. Com. in Ισαΐα 11, 10. P.G. 70, 328. De Incarn. Unig. P.G. 75, 1465.
 2. C. Nest. III. P.G. 76, 141.
 3. Ibid. "ἵνα ... χρηματίσωμεν Γένος, οὐδέτι τοῦ χοῖλου, ἀλλὰ τοῦ... ἐξ Οὐρανοῦ"
 4. Glaphyra in Numbers. P.G. 69, 620.
 5. De Incarn. Unig. P.G. 68, 657.
 6. De Incarn. Unig. P.G. 75, 1237.

type of all those who have life, while Adam was the original of all those who die.¹ The grace which was given to Adam was out of work in him because of his sin so that this should be renewed in the second Adam in Christ.²

Cyril considers it important to say that as man was expelled from Paradise because of Adam's disobedience, so he entered again into this lost paradise through Christ's obedience",³ and even more, as all men were condemned because of Adam's disobedience and transgression of the Divine Law and Commandment, so are we justified through Christ's perfect and blameless obedience.⁴

In order to express the truth of Christ as the origin of the New Creation, Cyril uses many other words of the same meaning. He calls Christ origin, root, or together origin and root,⁵ or vine⁶ or foundation⁷ or Head⁸ or recapitulation in the sense of the new beginning and principle.⁹ Cyril discusses the relations of man to Christ as the second Adam and speaks of some special relations.

(1) Every descendant of Adam can now be related to and united with Christ since He has already entered into mankind, has received human nature, and has sanctified it and called all members of mankind to salvation through Him. Christ has become ὁμογενής with man. That is why Christ is now

1. Com. in Rom. 1, 3. P.G. 74, 776. 76, 1392.

2. Com. in Joel. 2, 28. P.G. 71, 377.

3. Hom. Divers. 10. P.G. 77, 1020.

4. C. Anthropomorph. 23. P.G. 76, 1120.

5. Dial de Trinit. 3. P.G. 75, 853.

6. Com. in Ioan. 15, 1. P.G. 74, 333.

7. Com. in Zachar. 6, 9. P.G. 72, 96.

8. Com. in I Cor. 11, 13 P.G. 77, 880.

9. Com. in Ioan. 14, 20. P.G. 74, 273.

the real root and real head of the new Creation, of the new people. The unity with Him is now real, natural through the great mystery of the Incarnation. It was by receiving human nature that He entered really into the world of man¹ and it was because of their real Unity with Christ that men receive all good things that are His own,² including real life³ and immortality.⁴ All members of the human race can possess these gifts because they are offered to all human nature by the Grace of Christ's Resurrection.⁵ Because of their common root, Christ, and because Christ has elevated in Himself the whole of human nature, that relation may be called universal.⁶

(11) This first relation to Christ is the basis and foundation for another, which could be characterized as a personal, individual and which is mystical and spiritual. Cyril describes this relation as following. "I will receive them and bring them into friendly relationship both mystically and firmly. And anyone might say that, in as much as He has become man, He brought all men into friendly relationship by being of the same race; so that we are all united to Christ in a mystical relationship, in as much as He has become Man: but they are alienated from Him, who do not preserve the correspondent image of His Holiness. For in this way also the Jews, who are united in a family relationship with Abraham the faithful, because they were unbelieving, were deprived of that Kinship with him on account of the dissimilarity of character.....

-
1. Com. in Joan. 10, 14. P.G. 73, 1048.
 2. Thesaurus 20. P.G. 75, 333"Ὅσα ἐν Χριστῷ, ταῦτα καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς."
 3. Com. in Joan. 10, 10. P.G. 73, 1032.
 4. Com. in Joan. 10, 14. P.G. 73, 1048.
 5. Com. in Joan. 10, 10. P.G. 73, 1032.
 6. Com. in Joan. 10, 10. P.G. 73, 1048. Weigl. op. c. p.60.

they who are obedient and follow by a certain God-given Grace in the footsteps of Christ, no longer serve the shadows of the Law but the Commandments of Christ".¹ In this important passage Cyril explains this question and says that this higher relation to Christ consists in holy and virtuous living, when a man is recognized by Christ as belonging to Him; otherwise the first natural relation is useless.² And even more their spiritual and mystical relation to Christ must be dynamic, not static and should always become higher and deeper and more abundant until it becomes a perfect participation of the Spirit, which however now is not common to all and which will belong only to those who are justified by faith in Christ.³ So a new personal relation between believing man and Christ is created, a relation of holiness, of sanctification of justification, of an ever-progressive deification of man. The relation and Unity with Christ is necessary because man without God cannot do any good; without Christ, the real life, man is dead.⁴

Those two relations are undoubtedly connected since the first is a necessary presupposition of the second and because the first leads man to the state of a general Unity with Christ⁵ and then brings him to the second⁶ in which man is a real relation and true member of the Body of Christ. Therefore the first relation, the first state, is fundamental though it is called natural.⁷ Because both relations are closely and necessarily connected with each other, Cyril in some cases refers to both together and

1. Com. in Joan. 10, 26. P.G. 74, 20. (E.T. by Members of the English Church. Vol. II' London 1885, p.100.

2. Com. in Joan. 10, 14. P.G. 73, 1048.

3. Ibid 10, 10 P.G. 73, 1032.

4. Com. in Matth. 22, 26. P.G. 72, 452.

5. Com. in Joan. 1, 14. P.G. 73, 161 - 10, 14, P.G. 73, 1045, Thesaurus 15, P.G. 75, 292.

6. Ibid. Ibid. 10, 14. P.G. 73, 1048.

7. Weigl, op. c. p.61.

in parallel, when he speaks of man's Unity with God. We become sons of God naturally and by Grace: On the one hand naturally by being united with Him and on the other hand by Grace in Spirit".¹ Then man speaks of deification and of his supernatural relation to God.

This is Cyril's teaching about Christ as the second Adam in His relation to mankind. These ideas, no doubt, were not unknown to the Fathers before Cyril, even to the authors of the New Testament; Cyril, however, developed them as far as his teaching about man's salvation is concerned.

¹. De Rect. Fid ad Theod. 30, P.G. 76, 1177
-De Incarn. Unig. 75, 1229.

Chapter Three

The Three Offices of Jesus Christ

A. For the salvation of men the Incarnate Logos had 1) to teach them and show them the perfect truth and so take them out of darkness and ignorance, and illuminate their mind; 2) to free them from the Kingdom of Satan and make them members of His new spiritual kingdom; and 3) to redeem and save them from sin through His priceless sacrifice and to inaugurate in them a new holy life. So we speak about the three offices of Christ, in other words about Christ as the perfect teacher-prophet, as the perfect High Priest, and as the perfect King. This distinction of the three offices of Christ, which was made first by Eusebius of Caesarea¹, is clear in Cyril's writings and teaching, too. Cyril speaks of Jesus Christ as Prophet,² as High Priest,³ and as King.⁴

It has to be remembered here that all three offices of Christ are inseparably united. That is why Cyril sometimes mentions two or three together. Christ is said to be the King and High-Priest⁵ or King and the High Prophet.⁶

The Lord teaches as the Teacher and Prophet; proves Himself King by doing the miracles and offers as High Priest His sacrifice on the Cross, and is called "King whose Kingdom will have no end".

According to Cyril Jesus Christ was anointed God, when He became man;

-
1. Eccles history. 3, 11. P.G. 20, 72-3.
 2. De Adorat. 6. P.G. 68, 425.
 3. In Isaian 22, 20. P.G. 70, 517.
 4. In Hebr. 1, 8. P.G. 74, 961.
 5. In Isaian 11, 13. P.G. 70, 332. "Χριστός Βασιλεὺς καὶ Ἀρχιερεὺς"
 6. De Adorat. 6. P.G. 68, 425. "Ἡγεμόνα (Βασιλέα) τοῦ παντός ποιούμενοι τὸν Χριστόν, τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς καὶ καθ' ἡμᾶς Προφήτην"

although he remained God, He was anointed humanly for His mission. He was anointed in His humanity through the Holy Spirit, not just as prophets and other men were.

The Son was anointed when He was incarnate. Then He united the humanity to Himself, so that He might make both one.¹

I examine Christ's Anointment (or Crisis) in another chapter. Here I want only to say that although Christ was anointed for all His three offices at His incarnation and although all three offices are connected with each other, they are manifested sometimes with more stress of the one and sometimes with more stress of the other, e.g. His Priestly and Prophetic offices are manifested mainly in the so-called state of Kenosis of Christ from His birth until His Death, while the Kingly offices is manifested mainly in the so called state of exaltation or glorification, which starts exactly when the first ends.

Undoubtedly it was through His threefold office that Christ fulfilled His saving work for men. All three show the extension of His work and therefore none can be omitted, because Christ's Work would not then be full and perfect. All three offices mutually depend upon each other and none can be stressed at the expense of the others.

B' I' Christ as Prophet and teacher: Christ possessed in the highest degree and taught the unique, perfect and saving Truth.

Following the Holy Scripture Cyril speaks of Christ as Prophet who knows all things which will happen.² Again, He was not ignorant of all that had happened.³ Thus Christ's prophetic office was perfect. He

1. In Hebr. 1, 8. P.G. 74, 961.

2. In Isian, 44, 8. P.G. 70, 925.

3. Ibid.

possessed and taught the perfect truth about God, the World and man, and so He was the fulness of Prophets.¹ This Prophet-teacher was not a common man; He was not one of the Old Testament Prophets; He was the eternal Logos of God, was God the Son, and remained God even after His Incarnation.² Therefore He spoke and thought with His own authority as the one who Himself has the truth.

Jesus Christ was the perfect teacher and possessed the perfect truth because of the hypostatic Union of his human nature with the Divine nature of the Logos; and thus He was able to take the truth from His own inner source. That is why one has to be careful at this point: Christ is not a mere teacher, He is the Prophet who received the truth from Himself, since He was God.

II. Christ as King. Cyril often connects this kingly office with the prophetic.³ The knowledge of His truth cannot save us unless Christ with His kingly power overcomes and destroys the power of sin within us. So Christ as God with His great power fulfills the salvation of men.⁴ Again Cyril connects the kingly and priestly offices.⁵ In addition to His sacrifice on the Cross it is Christ as King who will raise us up and lead us to His eternal and Heavenly Kingdom.

Christ is always called King after His Incarnation because of His own power,⁶ which is really far greater than the power of human kings.⁷ Christ's kingly office was manifested not only during His last time on

-
1. De Adorat. P.G. 68, 140.
 2. In Isaian 54, 11. P.G. 70, 1212.
 3. De Adorat. 6. P.G. 68, 425.
 4. In Isaian. 8, 4. P.G. 70, 224.
 5. In Levitic. P.G. 69, 585.
 6. In Hebr. 1, 8. P.G. 74, 961.
 7. In Isaian 8, 4. P.G. 70, 224.

earth, after He died on the cross and descended to Hades; it is also manifested in His Church, and concretely in His work of gathering the members of the Church, governing her, protecting her from enemies and making here members more perfect, generally and individually.¹

Finally, as we shall see in the last chapter, Christ will show His kingly office for the last time when He comes for the universal judgement, when His saving work is completed, and when He will lead His people to His Father and offer the Kingdom to God the Father, so that God may be "all in all". And the son will be for ever glorified and His kingdom will have no end.²

III Christ as High Priest.

We deal with Christ's Priestly office last because we are going to examine in detail Cyril's teaching about it. Cyril, as we have seen, sees an inner relation between the priestly and the other offices:³ it would not be sufficient if Christ had only made God known to men; He had to reconcile us to God. For the realization of His Kingdom He had to offer His unique sacrifice so that those who would be saved through the Grace of His Sacrifice might become members of His Spiritual Kingdom.

Cyril often calls Jesus Christ High-Priest. As a Priest, after having become Man He offered Himself as a victim as equivalent for the life of us all⁴, for the forgiveness of our sins according to His divine Authority.⁵ He is High-Priest in His Humanity⁶ and so is humanly called

1. Martensen. Dogmatique (traduite par G. Ducros, Paris 1879 p.492.) also Trembelas P. op. c. II 199-200.

2. In Isaian 9, 6. P.G. 70, 257.

3. In Isaian 11, 13. P.G. 70, 332 // De Adorat. 6. P.G. 68, 425.

4. In Ioan. 17, 2. P.G. 74, 480.

5. In Hebr. 2, 17. P.G. 74, 965.

6. Ibid.

Priest.¹ And although Christ is the Victim in His Flesh, yet as God He receives the sacrifice² and is really Mediator between God and men.³

1. In Hebr. 7, 27. P.G. 74, 976. "ἄνθρωπίνως λεγόμενος Λειτουργός"

2. De Recta Fide Ad Augustas. P.G. 76, 1349.
P.G. 76, 1369.

3. Ibid. "Μεσίτης Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων"

Chapter Four

Salvation through the whole Saving Work of Jesus Christ

The Incarnation of the Logos was the presupposition of all His earthly life and His Death on the Cross, therefore the presupposition of Christ's redemptive sacrifice for men. Nor is there any doubt that Christ's death was the main means of man's salvation, and that His blood cleansed men from their sins, and that He showed His perfect obedience to His Eternal Father mainly in His Passion.

Cyril however teaches that the redemptive work of Jesus Christ was realized and fulfilled through all His earthly life which was a continuous perfect obedience,¹ for man's salvation. All His earthly life was a continuous sacrifice which was completed on the Cross. The drama of Christ's sacrifice therefore starts in Bethlehem.

That is why in Cyril's theology all the facts of Christ's earthly life are both important and necessary for the work of man's salvation.

1. Birth.

Christ's birth was His entrance into this world in His theanthropic Personality. Through His Birth He emptied Himself so that we may be able to look up and become strong.² And as He received the human things from men thus He gave to man His Own things.³ Therefore the mystery of His Economy was not fruitless,⁴ because His birth, His Incarnation opened the Gate of Salvation to men.⁵ So Christ through His Incarnation led men

1. C. Anthropom 23. P.G. 76, 1120.

2. De Sancta et Consust. Trinit. A'. 6. P.G. 75, 1033.

3. De Incarn. Unig. P.G. 75, 1472.

4. In Isaian 40, 9-11. P.G. 70, 808.

5. In Zachar. 9, 9. P.G. 72, 149.

back to His Father.¹ Because His Incarnation was not fruitless, all those who are united with Him through the Incarnation become fruitful spiritually.² That happens because He is the Vine and we become the branches receiving His vivifying power and food.³ Otherwise it would be impossible for a man to do good by Himself or to conquer sin and Satan.⁴ Christ was born in order that He, having received our human nature without sin, might condemn sin in His flesh and show sin to be weak so that we might be able in Him to win the same victory.⁵

2. Transfiguration. Christ's Transfiguration had a two fold purpose. Christ showed His Divine glory and power, but also His transfiguration was a type, an example of the future and eternal glory of all those who willingly belong to Christ's eternal Kingdom.⁶ This example was a real one. It is believed that the faithful people will participate in the eternal glory of Christ.

3. His Life. As we see in another chapter Christ in all His earthly life was absolutely sinless.⁷ As Theanthropos Christ was able to do miracles and as God of the Truth He was able to teach the people the real and Divine truth and to show them the saving light.⁸ Christ as the Divine Teacher did not destroy the old law but fulfilled it and changed the types of the Old Law into the reality⁹ so that what ever one could see in shadow and types not clearly, Christ showed it clearly.¹⁰ And

1. In Hebr. 9, 24. P.G. 74, 985.
2. In Isaian. 5, 6. P.G. 70, 144. "ἀποτελέσμεθα καρποφόροι."
3. In Isaian, 5, 5. P.G. 70, 141.
4. In Ioan. 14, 18. P.G. 74, 264.
5. De Incarnat. Unig. P.G. 75, 1429 // In Ioan. 11, 33, 74, 53.
6. In Luke 5, 29, P.G. 72, 656. "τῆς μελλούσης δόξης ὑπόδειγμα... ἡ Μεταμόρφωσις."
7. In Ioan. 16, 33. P.G. 74, 473.
8. In Isaian. 2, 5. P.G. 70, 73.
9. De Adorat. A'. P.G. 68, 140.
10. De Adorat. A'. P.G. 68, 141.

as the Divine King Christ created His new spiritual Kingdom and invited all to become members of the Kingdom.

4. Death.

Christ endured all His sufferings and Passion for men's salvation. Because all people were under sin, He, being sinless, accepted the punishment of the sinners, and so through the Cross He changed the decision of the old curse; through the Thorns He gave an end to Adam's punishments; through the vinegar He accepted in Himself the bitter and tiring and mortal life of men; through the vinegar He accepted men's tendency towards the worse and gave them the power to return to the better; through the purple He showed His kingship; through the reed He gave a hint of Satan's weakness; through the slap on His face He preached our freedom; He like Adam, was pierced in his side. But from His side no woman like Eve came out leading humankind to death, but a fountain of life vivifying the Mankind".¹ Through all these Christ worked and fulfilled men's salvation.

5. Descent to Hell. Christ's kingship was manifested clearly, firstly when just after His death on the Cross He, His soul, with the Divine Logos, descended into Hell. Christ's work there was twofold. He preached to those who were therefrom the beginning, freed and took them out, and so defeated Satan, and his power.² Thus devil was punished.³

6. Resurrection. Christ's Resurrection cannot be separated from the whole work of man's salvation. Cyril sees three basic reasons for Christ's

1. De Incarnat. Unigen. P.G. 75, 1465-8.

2. Pasch. Hom. 21. P.G. 77, 849 // In Isaian 51, 22. P.G. 70, 1141.

3. In Isaian. P.G. 70-1057.

"Τετιμώρηται αἱ κοληραὶ καὶ ἀντικείμεναι δυνάμεις"

resurrection:

(a) Christ rose again from the dead and so He destroyed the power and Kingdom of death.¹ Death could not keep Christ, the Lord of Life, under its authority.²

Although it is Christ who rose from the dead and so destroyed the power of death, however, Cyril does not hesitate to say that it was God the Father who through His Son's resurrection destroyed death.³

(b) When Cyril comes to discuss this point, he explains that this destruction of death should not be understood just only negatively. This destruction means also that men participate in the Resurrection. All men will rise because this has been given to all human nature on account of the grace from Christ's resurrection. "In Christ who first abolished the Kingdom of death and rose into Eternal life all believing people will rise with Him, and will sit in His Heavenly Kingdom".⁴

This passage is very important. Here Cyril contrasts Christ with Adam. Adam was the cause of men's death, Christ was the cause of men's resurrection and eternal life. And even more, it is only through Christ and His resurrection that men can obtain the grace of resurrection. And it is in this sense that Christ can be called the First born of the Creation".⁵ If Christ had not risen from the dead, men could not speak of resurrection and life at all.

Here it has to be noticed that it is again through the union of the two natures that we can understand Christ's resurrection. Cyril teaches

1. De Adorat. 10, P.G. 68, 656 // "Ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνεβίω Χριστός, τό ἀμειδές τοῦ

2. In Isaian. 1, 29, P.G. 70, 64. /θανάτου καταλύσας κράτος"

3. In Isaian 50, 9. P.G. 70, 1096.

4. In Rom. 6, 6, P.G. 74, 796. "συνεγγέρῃται λεγόμεθα τῷ Χριστῷ, συγκαθεῖσθαι

5. De Trinit. Dial. P.G. 75, 1160. /δέ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις"

that all the above happens "because Christ has become One of us."¹

The Incarnation of Christ in the general as well as in the narrower sense is the presupposition of men's participation in Christ's resurrection.

In the risen Flesh of Christ all human flesh is risen.

(c) In discussing the problem of men's resurrection, Cyril speaks of men's eternal life². And if we connect the fact that death was the result of sin, with the fact that man's justification from the negative point of view, is forgiveness of sin, and that through His resurrection Christ destroyed the power of sin, then we can understand what Cyril means, when he says that, "We are justified in the risen Christ".³

It is in this sense that according to Cyril, Christ is called "first-born from the dead". He rose first and so He opened and destroyed the doors of death.⁴ Therefore in the risen Christ we have been risen.⁵ The incorruptibility of man's body is the consequence of man being risen in the risen Christ.⁶ Christ's power and glory from His resurrection becomes therefore ours, too.⁷

7. Ascension: The saving work of Christ is connected with His Ascension to Heaven and His sitting eternally at the right hand of the Father.

Cyril says that Christ ascended to His Heavenly Father for us, in order that He might make Heaven possible to those who are on earth⁸. He became the beginning, "Origin" of the ascension of the new and incorrupted man-kind.⁹ Cyril explains this idea in another passage: "Not as God but as

1. In Rom. 6, 6. P.G. 74, 796-97. "ἐπεὶ τοι γέγονε καθ' ἡμᾶς ὡς εἷς ἐξ ἡμῶν"

2. In Rom. 6, 6, P.G. 74, 796-97.

3. In Psalm 40, 11. P.G. 69, 997.

4. De Trinit. Dial. P.G. 75, 1160. "Πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν... ὡς πρῶτος ἀναστάς"

5. Thesaurus 23. P.G. 75, 385. "Ἀναστάντος Αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς ἀνέστημεν"

6. Thesaurus 15. P.G. 75, 281.

7. In Isaian 49, 25 P.G. 70, 1080 / In Ioan 7, 8. P.G. 73, 641.

8. Epist. 1. P.G. 77, 37 / In Amos. 9, 6. P.G. 71, 569.

9. Epist. 41, P.G. 77, 220.

man for us He enters the Heavenly gates leading us to these gates, opening them to us. He showed Himself highest as man in order that we might become High in Him by wearing His likeness".¹

Even more Christ's Ascension was another proof that He destroyed death,² and its power. Cyril repeats the Biblical teaching that Christ ascended to the Heavens where He will be for ever "paracletos" asking His Father for ever for us.³

As we have seen, the whole life of Christ even the smallest event of His life, was important and necessary for the whole work of men's salvation which was completed and fulfilled on Christ's Cross.

1. Thesaurus 20, P.G. 75, 332.

2. In Zachar. 14, 6-7, P.G. 72, 249.

3. Paschal Hom. 11. P.G. 77, 633.

" Ἀνελήφθη πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα Παράκλητος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν"

Fourth Section

The Nature of Salvation

Here I am discussing and examining the results of Christ's saving work, i.e. the nature of Man's Salvation, according to Cyril's teaching. This doctrine was never officially formulated by the ancient Fathers¹ and therefore not even by Cyril. However we can find the same tradition among the Fathers. In the investigation of the question of Salvation Cyril did not excel his predecessors, but to him we owe the Synthesis of their teachings. This Combination and the vigorous and exact language in which it is expressed gives Cyril's doctrine its strength and also its appearance of being new.²

I approach the problem of Cyril's teaching about Man's Salvation in three ways.

- (i) Salvation of man with regard to God:
- (ii) Salvation of man with regard to God and man, together:
- (iii) Salvation of man with regard to man.

In the first case, we have to see how God's perfect Properties were and still are manifested in the work of man's Salvation and mainly His Divine Love, His Righteousness, His Wisdom and His Power. In the second case, we will see and examine the relations between man and God as they have become after man's Salvation. These new relations involve one truth with two aspects; the propitiation of God's Righteousness and the destruction of sin which was the obstacle of the relations between man and God. And in the final case, we have to see what exactly Christ offered to man, in other words, Man's Salvation in its essence.

1. Agourides Sabbas. The N. Testament doctrine of Atonement according to the Orthodox Tradition. Athens 1964, p.3, 4.

2. Riviere J. op. c. I. 236.

Chapter OneSalvation of Man with Regard to God.

In the work of man's Salvation the perfect Properties of God were manifested.

(a) God's Love and Philanthropia. As we have seen, the Incarnation of the Logos and the death of Christ were caused only by God's eternal, great Love for His creatures.¹ This Love is shown much greater, when we remember that Christ died for men though they were sinners and not worthy of such a Love.² That is why Cyril says that Christ saved men without any payment on the part of man.³ Therefore man's salvation was only an action of God's free Love, gift of His grace.⁴ In the work of his Salvation man did not offer anything.⁵ God's Love was so great that He gave His life, His Blood as equivalent and Ransom.⁶ Only God's Love could realise such a work. This truth explains the fact that God saved man although He was not bound to do so. That is why Cyril calls the whole Divine Economy as *Συγκατάβασις*.⁷

(b) God's Wisdom. According to the Scriptures, man had to be punished, as God had said.⁸ But God's eternal Will was to save men. Now, if God was to save them, then men would not be punished since their salvation would mean deliverance from any punishment. But if men were not punished, then God's Word would not be true. Here we can see how God, in His great Wisdom found the way in which He realised both His promise about man's punishment as well as man's Salvation. The eternal

-
1. In Ioan, 3, 16. P.G. 73, 252. "Τό μέγα τῆς Ἀγάπης τοῦ Θεοῦ"
 2. In Isaian. 62, 6. P.G. 70, 1373. "Σέσωκεν ὄντας ἁμαρτωλοὺς καὶ προσηγάγετο"
 3. In Genes. 2. P.G. 69, 93. /φιλανθρώπως οὐκ ὄντας ἀξίους τοῦ σώζεσθαι"
 4. In Isaian 34, 16. P.G. 70, 1456.
 5. In Jerem. 36, 16. P.G. 70, 1456. "προσενεγκόντες οὐδέν"
 6. In Isaian 41, 25. P.G. 70, 845. // In Isaian 45, 9. P.G. 70, 957.
 7. De Incarn. Unig. P.G. 75, 1460.
 8. De Incarn. Unig. 27. P.G. 70, 1465. "....ὑπεύθυνοι τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἐτύχχανον"

Logos became Flesh, and man met Him as Theanthropos. He took upon Himself all the sins of all people and died for all and instead of all, and so he was condemned, as the greatest of sinners, as the representative of all the sinful Human race.¹ Thus He satisfied the Divine Righteousness which was insulted by man's sin and, at the same time, He offered Salvation to man.² The wisdom of God was manifested in another way, too. Christ was able to save man even by one word only, by one Commandment. However, he found the way of the Incarnation, which was more suitable on man's part, because "He willed that we should participate in the work of our Salvation. And because of that He assumed human nature, which was sinful..... but He freed it from sin and Satan and death.... and through what He received (i.e. the human nature) He offered Freedom to all human race".³

(c) God's Righteousness. Cyril sees God's righteousness in many ways:

(i) Christ, as the powerful God was able, as we have seen, only by His Order to beat Satan's power and to realize our Salvation.⁴

But this action would be tyrannic, not righteous. Therefore Christ had to offer a ransom for delivering and saving men. Undoubtedly, this ransom was not offered to Satan. I examine the meaning of this offering in another chapter. There is no doubt, however, that Christ offered Himself. ὡς ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων⁵

(ii) Cyril presents another aspect of this point. The victory of Christ

1. In Isaian, 53, 7. P.G. 70, 1181. " κατακέχριται ὡς ἁματωλός"
 2. Homil. Divers 12. P.G. 77, 1041. " Γέγονε Σωτηρία λαοῦ"
 3. De Incarn. Unig. 18, P.G. 75, 1448.
 4. De Incarn. Unig. 18, P.G. 75, 1448. " καὶ μόνῳ προστάγματι..
 5. De Adorat. 15. P.G. 68, 972.

would not have been righteous if He was only God, since everything is possible to God, even to beat the Devil. It was necessary that the Logos, through His human nature should beat him and so make fallen man victor against the Devil. The only-begotten Logos of God became man and entered the house of Satan and captured him¹ and then Jesus Christ threw Satan and his power.² Christ, through His own Power, bit Satan and destroyed his power.³

(iii) Another aspect can be found in the satisfaction of the Divine Righteousness since man through his sin had insulted God.

If we combine all these three aspects already mentioned, we can see Cyril's understanding of the manifestation of God's Righteousness in man's Salvation.

(d) His Power. Cyril sees God's Power in man's Salvation, firstly in the very fact of His Οἰκονομία and secondly in its results.

The Incarnation and the Resurrection were only possible for a very powerful God,⁴ since these events were supernatural and mysterious. Afterwards Christ showed His own Divine Power when He, through His death and His glorious Resurrection, destroyed the power of Satan and sin and created a new Kingdom, which is much stronger than any other power in the world.

1. In Isaian. 52, 3. P.G. 70, 1148. "...εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ "

2. In Isaian. 26, 5. 70.

3. In Psalm XLII, 4. P.G. 69, 1229. "Κατήγγησε τὸν ἄρχοντα τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦτου "

4. In Isaian 11, 45. P.G. 70, 909. /δυνάμει δηλονότι Θεοπρεπεστάτη χρώμενος"

Chapter Two

Salvation of Man with regard both to God and Man together

Cyril's understanding of Reconciliation.

Speaking of the new relations between God and man after his Salvation Cyril discusses the question of reconciliation. He speaks often of this reconciliation, of the Atonement, of the restoration of the relations of God and man. There is no doubt that we have to develop and present the doctrine of Reconciliation in the light of definite christological perceptions and propositions focussing attention upon Jesus Christ as the Beginning, the Middle and the End.¹

The idea of reconciliation presupposes (I) the existence of two persons between whom the reconciliation takes place, and, in this case, Cyril speaks of reconciliation between God and man: (II) the existence of an enmity between these two persons - in our case the enmity was caused by man's transgression of God's Law, by man's sin.² This sin caused the enmity as barrier in the relations of man and God.³ And because this enmity was caused by Adam's sin, it is called 'the ancient enmity';⁴ (III) The guilt of the offender who transgressed the Command of God and broke the first relations of man and God - in our case man was the guilty one. In the reconciliation between man and God: God the Son is the reconciler through His Sacrifice.⁵

According to Cyril, Christ reconciled the world to God. Man wanted to be reconciled because he had offended God. He was guilty, and being

1. Barth op. c.v. IV. 1 p.125.

2. In Isaian 52, 6-7. P.G. 70, 1153.

3. In Isaian. P.G. 70, 333. "Μεσότοιχον"

4. De Adorat. 3. P.G. 68, 292. "Ἀρχαία Ἐχθρά"

5. Thesaurus 12, P.G. 75, 185.

estranged from God, was most unhappy.

Reconciliation is a change of the relations between God and man, a new state of peace and adoption by God, which man has now entered into. Christ came as our Peacemaker, took away the enmity which existed between us and led us to friendship with the Father, and, through Himself, He united us again with God. Through Him we have obtained access to the Father.¹ Here it should be noted, that although reconciliation means a change of relations, Cyril nevertheless, does not speak of any change in the mind or will of God who is unchangeable and whose Will is always the same.²

Salvation of man was not a new thought and decision of God, but existed in His Mind as a Plan, eternally.³

(IV) The reconciling person is a mediator between the two persons who are to be reconciled. This reconciling person should represent both parties. In our case, it is Jesus Christ who is the reconciling One, the Mediator between God and man. In another chapter I speak of Christ as Mediator. Here I should like to say only that Christ, because of the hypostatic unity, was both God since He was the eternal Logos, true God, and at the same time Man, through the Incarnation, the Logos became perfect man. Because of the Incarnation Christ represents God to us and us to God. In this way He is God's Revelation to us and our reconciliation with God.⁴

God is not only the reconciler, through His Sacrifice; He is also

-
1. In Isaian, 52, 6-7. P.G. 70, 1153. "...ἐπέφανεν ὁ Χριστός..τὴν ἔχθραν ἀφελών
 2. C. Julian. 4. 117. P.G. 76, /καὶ τῷ Πατρὶ συνάψας ἡμᾶς δι' ἑαυτοῦ"
 3. Thesaurus. P.G. 75, 560. " Ἀρχαία Βουλὴ"
 4. Barth, K. op. c.v. I 2. p.151.

He who is reconciled, since He was the offended One.¹ This means that man needed to be reconciled to God since he was the offender. God never ceased being a God of Love, and the reconciliation in Christ was the fulfilment of God's Will for the restoration of the relations between Man and God; In this way, man would be able to become again Child of God.

Cyril finds the reconciliation to be possible even on the part of God, and so we can speak of the possibility of reconciliation on God's part. God is personal God and as such He has a personal character. When Cyril says that God is unchangeable, he certainly means that God's character is unchangeable, and not His actions. God does not deny Himself. This idea makes clear the possibility of reconciliation. Cyril says that our nature has become well-accepted in Christ, because we, who were expelled because of Adam's transgression, have now been brought to the Father through Christ.²

Our union with God is undoubtedly relative. Through Him we become participants of the Divine Nature, and though we were estranged, we have now come near Him and we are united to God the Father relatively.

All those who are united with the same Father, and are partakers of the same Spirit, are united to each other,³ too.

This reconciliation between man and God becomes real. Christ offers to man the absolute remission of all his sins which were the cause of separation of their relations,⁴ and all men are delivered from every sin.⁵

After Christ put away sin which had broken our relations with God,

1. Adorat I P.G. 68, 148. Thesaurus 15. P.G. 75, 280.

2. In Psalm 15, 8. P.G. 69, 812. "Ἐγένονεν ἡ φύσις ἡμῶν εὐδόκιμος ἐν Χριστῷ "

3. Adv. Nestor. 5, 1. P.G. 76, 213. "καὶ ἐν ἀλλήλοις ὡς ἐν μιᾷ πίσται...διὰ

4. Thesaurus 32, P.G. 75, 468. /τό ἐνός μετεσχηκέναι Πνεύματος"

5. In Duodecim Prophetas P.G. 71, 897.

there is no obstacle now between man and God.¹ This is the reason why Christ is called Covenant of Life and Peace.² He, Himself, is our peace³ which He does not take it from outside because peace is the property of God.⁴ Through Christ men have "Σύμβασιν πρὸς Θεόν" because He is our Καταλλαγή.⁵ It is only Christ who is the Reconciliation between God and man.⁶

As we shall see, this forgiveness is not limited. All sins are forgiven and so our reconciliation can be perfect, objectively. It is necessary to remember that this is the objective aspect of forgiveness. Later on, we shall consider forgiveness subjectively. Since sin is destroyed, it therefore does not exist as reality and man is not condemned any more. I shall examine these questions, later on.

1. In Isaiam 1. P.G. 70, 1205. "Συνήφθημεν τῷ Πατρὶ διὰ μέσου τοῦ Χριστοῦ"

2. In Malachian 2, 5. P.G. 72, 309.

3. In Isaiam 2, 4. P.G. 70,

4.

5. De Sancta Trinit. P.G. 75, 845.

6. Ibid. "Ὅτε τοίνυν εἰς Χριστὸν τις ᾗτοι πρὸς Καταλλαγὴν, Θεῷ καταλλαγήσεται καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ τὴν Σύμβασιν κόσμος ἔχει πρὸς Θεόν"

Chapter Three

Salvation with regard to Man himself: Redemption.

Cyril sees man's salvation as a whole and as realized through the whole saving work of Jesus Christ, as I have said. That is why he approaches it from all aspects and it is in bringing together all these aspects that we can understand Cyril's teaching about the nature of Salvation. Here I should like to say again what I said in examining the Soteriological teaching of the Fathers. By the general term "Incarnation" Cyril means not only the concrete fact of Christ's Birth and coming into our world in a human form, but generally the whole *Economia* of the Logos, His whole Saving Work, His Birth, His Life, His Death, His Resurrection and His Ascension. In this chapter I am trying to point out Cyril's general understanding of Christ's saving work from all aspects and man's Salvation in every sense. As I have said in the beginning of this Fourth Section, in Cyril we find an harmonious and excellent synthesis of the teaching of the previous Fathers, a synthesis, a teaching expressed by Cyril in an excellent, exact, vigorous language and way.

A' Synthesis of all Conceptions of Salvation.

I' Cyril lays stress on the very fact of the Incarnation, the unity of human and divine nature, and on the elevation and deification of the whole human nature.¹ The Incarnation was necessary, because only by Christ's assumption of the whole human nature, it could be saved. "Ὁ μὴ προσείληπται οὐδέ σέσωται."²

1. Quod Unus sit Christus P.G. 75, 1320. "Γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος ... λαβὼν σὺν αὐτῇ

2. In Ioan. 12, 27. P.G. 74 - 89. /τά αὐτῆς... ἵνα τὴν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου κατασεμνύνη /φύσιν"

As Christ came to save the whole human body and Soul, He assumed the whole human nature.¹ The Only-Begotten Son became man, like us, but perfect man, in order that He might free the earthly body from corruption, through His Self-Emptying... and making the human Soul His Own, might make it stronger than sin.

Because of this unity, the whole human nature is offered Grace and is enriched with gifts and honour from Christ.² So Christ's victory over the Devil and sin becomes man's victory as well.³ Cyril often speaks of the great elevation of human nature through Christ who being God by nature, becomes Man, in order that, He, having received human nature, might beautify, elevate and make it part of His Glory.⁴

In this elevation human nature only receives, while the divine only offers. So human nature receives divine grace, sanctification, and deification, which were first realised in the human nature of Christ.⁵ According to this conception, which we shall consider again later, man's salvation consists in the elevation, sanctification and deification of man. This salvation is the result of the unity of the human and divine natures in the Person of the Logos, the Incarnate.

As the Logos has the whole human nature in Himself, the human nature and not a part i.e. body alone or the soul alone, but both elements of the human nature participate in the deification. Cyril says: "That what has not been assumed, has not been saved."⁶ This important phrase can be

1. De Incarnat. Unig. P.G. 75, 1213. "καθ' ἡμᾶς γέγονε τέλειος ἄνθρωπος"

2. In Luke, 5, 24. P.G. 72, 568.

3. In Luke, 4, 9. P.G. 72, 532.

4. De Incarn. Unigen. P.G. 75, 1320. "...ἵνα τὴν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου κατασεμνύνη φόβον"

5. Thesaurus, 20. P.G. 75, 333. " ...ἵνα ἡμεῖς ἁγιασθῶμεν ἐν Αὐτῷ"

6. In Ioan, 12, 27. P.G. 74, 89.

understood both Christologically and Soteriologically. Christ has received the whole human nature in Himself. And since whatever has been received by the Logos has been saved, therefore the whole human nature has been saved. This whole humanity is to be understood in a twofold sense. Christ has offered the salvation to all mankind without any exception and saves also the whole nature of each man, his soul and his body. Man is sanctified both in his soul and his body. Man's body becomes the temple of God's spirit and is honoured greatly. The whole human personality is redeemed. And it was through His perfect Divine - human personality that Christ saved men. And because of the representative character of His Mystery of Economía the whole personality of each member of mankind receives the benefits of Christ's Incarnation and Death.¹ And for this reason Christ's victory is our victory.²

II' Christ through His Words, His teaching, and mainly through His Holy and blameless life, had a unique and decisive influence upon men. Cyril sometimes refers to this conception of Christ's work. "The Only-Begotten Son, being God, because of His Love for us, emptied Himself and took the form of a Servant, in order to lead us to the knowledge of all virtues. For only in this way could He persuade those who were in complete ignorance to become prudent and to adore not creation but the Creator³

So, man was given an excellent and perfect knowledge of God. This knowledge is firstly a perfect Knowledge of God in Trinity. "Our Lord

¹. In Luke 11, 20. P.G. 72, 704.

². In Luke 4, 9. P.G. 72, 532.

³. In Ioan 14, 28. P.G. 74, 309. "...ἵνα πάντας ...ἀπευθύνη πρὸς πάντων εἰδέναι / ἀρετῆς"

Jesus Christ brought to a perfect knowledge..... perfect knowledge about God is not only to know that there is a God, but to know that He is the Father and therefore He is the Father of a Son with the Holy Spirit".¹ Furthermore, Christ revealed that God is not only God but that He is also our Father.

In addition, Christ was mainly the perfect example of holy life.² It was necessary that Christ, therefore, should have been chosen to be the perfect example of holy and sinless life,³ because, in this way, man could see this holy life in reality and not only in theory, and be able to follow this example. The reason why Christ fasted in the desert was, not for Himself, since He had no need to, but in order to give Himself to us as an example-typos - of the excellent life".⁴

Cyril sees the example for perfect instruction and teaching in all the movements and actions of Christ. In the case of His unbelieving disciples, Cyril thinks that Christ did that οἰκονομικώτατα in the sea, so that, after the storm became dangerous, His divine power might become clearer. He could even quell the waves. For this reason He sleeps, to make them feel, all the greater, what happened.⁵ Again, in the case of the Good Samaritan, Cyril sees an important example of teaching. The Good Samaritan put the wounded man on his horse. Christ wanted to show that He was willing to bear the sins of corrupted man, Himself, and heal his wounded nature. And, like the Good Samaritan, Christ has led man

1. In Ioan. 17, 6-8. P.G. 74, 500. "Ο Πατήρ δι' Υἱοῦ ἐν Πνεύματι"

2. In Ioan. 15, 9. P.G. 74, 372. " Τῆς εὐαγοῦς Πολιτείας Ὑπογραμμόν"

3. In Luke 3, 21. P.G. 72, 524.

4. In Luke, 4, 2. P.G. 72, 528. "...τύπον ἡμῖν τὰ καθ' ἑαυτὸν εἰς ὑπογραμμόν

5. In Luke 8, 22. P.G. 72, 629. /ἀνατιθεῖς"

to the Inn, i.e. to His Church which accepts all those who need spiritual healing and help.¹

And, finally, Cyril finds this idea of example in all the acts of Christ's life. All these events are events of His Self-Emptying for man's salvation.²

Christ showed God and the Divine Holy Life to man so that they might be able to see a perfect and concrete example of Holy Life.

III' It was through His Cross and Death, that Christ realised and fulfilled His Saving work, destroyed the power of sin, reconciled man to God, freed man from the authority of Satan, led man to a New Life, and made man 'a new creation' based mainly upon Christ's Cross and Death. I lay stress on this point, because I disagree completely with those, who say that Cyril uses only the doctrine of the Incarnation.

The Representative Character of Christ's Sacrifice

From the dogma of the perfection of the human nature in Christ, we can come easily to an important conclusion. This elevation, perfection and deification of the human nature would have remained a property only of Christ unless He through His representative Sacrifice had become Propitiatus Victim propitiating God to the transgressors men, and unless He through His Mediatorship had reconciled the sinful mankind to God.

1. In Luke 10, 34. P.G. 72, 681.

2. De Rect. fid. ad Theod. 19 P.G. 76, 1160.

"He was crucified instead of all and for all so that, the One being for all, all may live in Him".¹

Here I should only say that our incorporation with the divine nature came to the highest stage on the Cross of Christ, so that the elevation of our nature and its salvation cannot be separated from the redemptive death of Christ. Therefore the sacrifice of Christ is an ἑξελαστήριος θυσία. It was through only one sacrifice that Christ completed the work of man's salvation.

Cyril lays stress on the fact that "Christ did not offer His sacrifice for Himself, since He as God, being sinless, needed no salvation,² but, only for us the sinner." Again, Christ offered Himself not for the purpose of a mere moral education and teaching of the people but for the remission of their sins and the inauguration of a new life.

Now, since Christ offered Himself as a Sacrifice willingly, He was not simply a victim of men's wickedness. Mankind was on the Cross of Christ in a two-fold way; it was represented both by the people who crucified Christ and by its perfect origin and root, Christ, Who died on the Cross for all people and instead of all people. Christ being sinless became "sin for us"³ by God who let Him die as a sinner, a representative of all sinful mankind. It was all mankind which as sinful had to be punished and to die. But even if all men had died, they could not realize their salvation. That is why Christ died instead of all, in order to realize what all men were unable to do. Again, it was the hypostatic union which

1. In Ioan. 2. P.G. 73, 565. "Ἐσταυρώθη ὑπὲρ πάντων καὶ διὰ πάντας"

2. Anathem. 10. P.G. 76, 309 // In Isaian 9, 67. P.G. 70, 253.

3. Glaphyra in Levitic. P.G. 69, 549.

"Γέγονεν ἁμαρτία ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν"

made the representative character of Christ's sacrifice possible. The Incarnate Logos died in His Human Nature as the new origin of the whole of human nature, while He Himself as God was able to offer salvation for all men.

Christ took on Himself all the punishment which was ours and in this way our sins have lost their power.¹

It was only through Christ's representative sacrifice that all mankind ruled over sin and Satan.

The meaning of the Ransom offered by Christ

Like other Fathers, Cyril speaks of a Ransom "offered by Jesus Christ on the Cross to God the Father for the life of all"² and for their deliverance from the power of sin and the devil.

Cyril asserts that because of sin Satan had a power and authority over men; His power however was not limitless. Satan is called ruler of this world not as being a true and real lord but as having received his power in a deceitful way, because he tried to keep man away from God and under his power. But men were not his own creatures, they did not belong to him and so his authority was untrue and wrong. That is why he lost his power when Christ became the divine Victor against him, and this was very right.³

1. In Isaian 53, 7. P.G. 70, 1181. "Κατακέκριται ὡς ἁμαρτωλός"

2. In Isaian 24, 23. P.G. 70, 556. "Ἀντίλυτρον ἑαυτὸν προσεκόμισε τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ"

3. In Ioan. 14, 30. P.G. 74, 329. "Ἀρχοντα τοῦ κόσμου πρὸς τὸ παρὸν ὠνόμασε τὸν σατανᾶν οὐχ ὡς ἀληθῶς ὄντα δεσπότην, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ τινὰ τῶν λιτηρίων βαρβάρων πλεονεξίας νόμῳ κρατήσαντα, τῶν κατ' οὐδένα τρόπον προσηκόντων αὐτῷ. Ὑφ' ἑαυτῷ γὰρ ἐποιήσατο διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας τὸν ἄνθρωπον καὶ ὥσπερ τινὰ ποιμνην ἀνεπιστάτητον ἀποβουκολήσας Θεοῦ τῶν ἁλλοτρίων ἐκράτει. Τοιγάρτοι καὶ τῆς οὕτω πορισθείσης ἀρχῆς δικαίως ἐκβέβληται"

Cyril never says that Christ had to offer his blood to Satan.

I have not found even one case where Cyril speaks of Christ's offering the ransom to Satan. On the contrary Cyril says that Christ offered His blood to His father. However, I think that by these general expressions Cyril wanted to express figuratively the very fact of Christ Who as a Lamb offered Himself as Sacrifice in order to deliver men from sin and make them clean and sinless, lead them to the Father,¹ and generally save them. I also think that speaking of Christ offering Himself as a Gift to the Father² he does not see this idea from the part of the Father since He never asked for such an offering, but from the part of the Son, of the Incarnate Logos, who was willing to offer Himself for men's salvation.

Christ's Love and Sacrifice

Speaking generally of Christ's Incarnation we saw that Christ's Love for man's salvation was the cause of His Incarnation. Now speaking, too, of Christ's sacrifice on the Cross, I have to say that according to Cyril we cannot understand nor explain the great fact of His Cross, unless we see it in the light of His saving eternal Love.

And for this reason Cyril often insists that Christ offered Himself

-
1. Thesaurus 29. P.G. 75, 436. "Υπὲρ αὐτῶν ὡς Ἀμνὸν ἁμῶν 'Εαυτὸν προσήνεγκε"
 2. De Adorat. 11, P.G. 68, 768. "ὁ πάντα γινος Ἱερεὺς ὁ δῶρον ὥσπερ τι ἐξαίρετον
Ibid. 12, P.G. 68, 813. /'Εαυτὸν ἀνατιθείς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τῷ Πατρὶ"

for man's salvation although men did not deserve it.

Men did not offer because they could not offer anything to pay for His Divine ransom.¹

Men did not deserve to be saved, though human soul is invaluable. Cyril wanted to show the greatness of Christ's free and saving love as well as the smallness and weakness of sinful men, and their impossibility to be saved except only through Christ.

As men did not offer anything to Christ's work for their salvation, Christ saved men δωρεάν.²

Since men could not themselves buy their salvation, Christ offered it to them as a present - gift because of His φιλανθρωπία. By Philanthropia we should understand God's special love for man.

So here we have an important point of Cyril's theology. God loves all His creation. But He loves man in a special way, in a special degree, more than all the other creatures. God showed His special love to men by creating them in a special way, by the special gifts that He offered to men by His special Providence and mainly by sending His Own Son to the earth for man's salvation.

Probably this was what Cyril wanted to express with the theological term Philanthropia. Speaking of Christ offering Himself for men, Cyril sometimes says that Christ offered His soul.³

In these cases Cyril uses the word Soul instead of life because even in New Testament Soul means sometimes life.

1. In Isaian 62, 6 P.G. 70, 1373, In Isaian 6, 9. P.G. 70, 185.

2. Glaphyra in Genes. 2, P.G. 69, 93.

3. In Isaian 45, 9. P.G. 70, 957. "...Θεόν ὄντα κατὰ φύσιν Υἱόν, κενῶσαι μὲν ἑαυτόν, ἐλέσθαι δὲ καὶ παθεῖν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν καὶ οὕτω μεγάλης ἀξιῶσαι φειδοῦς τοῦς ὄντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ὡς ἀντάλλαγμα τὴν ἰδίαν προέσθαι ἡ ψυχὴν".

We can see how Cyril bases his teaching on the Holy Scriptures so that he uses even Biblical words in their special meanings.

Since Christ by His Sacrifice and Blood "bought men", saving them, "men do not belong to themselves but only to Christ who bought and saved them".¹ We belong to Christ more than we belong to ourselves. And even more we find ourselves only when we belong to Christ and only when we remain belonging to Him.

Then we can feel the greatness of God's love for us.

It is much better for men to belong to Christ even as His slaves than to be free from Him but slaves of themselves and to sin.

IV' There is no doubt that all men even as sinners belonged to their Creator as His Creatures and depend upon God.² But man being created free³ disobeyed God and obeyed the Devil. He, being "criminal"⁴ attacked men and imposing his Ζυγός upon them, led them away from God,⁵ and keeping them under his own power as his slaves governed them bitterly and badly.⁶ He found them as a flock without a shepherd since they abandoned God by reason of their sins. God and sin are two irreconcilable things. Satan tried to make the human flock his own.⁷ He was the inventor of sin and became men's tyrant working against the plan and will of God for men⁸ so that he was keeping men as his own as if he had authority and power and sovereignty upon them.⁹ The Devil possessed such a power upon

1. In Isaian 45, 13. P.G. 70, 959. "ὅχι ἐσμέν ἑαυτῶν ἀλλὰ τοῦ προαιμένου καὶ σώσαντος"

2. In Ioan. 17, 8. P.G. 74, 501.

3. In Isaian 9, 4. P.G. 70, 249. "ἐλευθέρους ὄντας τοὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς"

4. In Isaian 27, 1. P.G. 70, 591. "δεινός καὶ φιλοκακοῦργος"

5. In Ioan. 14, 30. P.G. 74, 329.

6. In Isaian 19, 21. P.G. 70, 472. "δεδεμένους ἔχων τοὺς ὑφ' ἑαυτῶν"

7. In Ioan. 14, 30. P.G. 74, 329.

8. In Is. 10, 31. P.G. 70, 305. "τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τοῦ Θεοῦ κατεστρατεύετο"

9. Ibid. 6, 1-3. P.G. 70, 176. "κατεκράτει τῆς ὑπ' οὐρανόν"

men because they themselves in sinning and obeying him made him their master for a while.¹ Therefore the reason for this should be found in men's sin, which became a law within man - the law of man's flesh. Cyril speaks often of the law of sin. But it was Satan himself who led men to sin since he knew that only thus they could become his slaves and could abandon God.² Satan's will is sin.

But Devil's sovereignty over men was wrong and not natural because he, as we have seen, used guile to lead men away from God in order to make them his slaves. He had no authority upon them by nature nor by birth, for they belonged to God.

That is why Christ judged both Satan and men, and as Judge He repelled Satan's covetousness and deprived him of all his tyranny over men, while He had mercy upon men who were suffering the Devil's power.³ There is no doubt that Christ's judgement against the Devil was absolutely right.⁴

Cyril insists that Christ not simply judged Satan but as true Governor of men fought against the strange tyrant and in fighting He won for us, for all men's deliverance, so that His victory became our victory⁵. Satan in this fight used the weapons he had, but His opponent Christ, remained unwounded and invincible.⁶

In his fighting Satan had thought that Christ was a mere and common man, because Christ had hidden His glorious Divinity by the smallness of

1. In Isaia 8, 4. P.G. 70, 224.

2. In Isaian 9, 4. P.G. 70, 249.

3. In Psalm. 7, 9. P.G. 69, 752.

4. In Isaian 28, 6. P.G. 70, 620. "Ὁρθόδοξια".

5. In Isaian 10, 14. P.G. 70, 288. "Ἀντέληγεν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν Χριστός".

6. Thesaurus P.G. 75, 144.

His humanity for a while. But when he reached Christ he did not find Him whom he expected. And Christ destroyed him completely for our sake and our good.

Now, Cyril finds, another reason too, for Christ's victory, "If death is the punishment of sin, the one who is sinless, does not die but lives". "Sin used to send people to death and it was right, but when "sin condemned" with the same judgement and righteous and innocent Christ, immediately sin (Satan) as unjust lost its authority.¹ Christ really freed men from their position of slavery² and thus the Devil's tyranny could not last for ever,³ after Christ's sign of victory i.e. the Holy Cross appeared⁴ so it happened after the eternal Logos was incarnate.⁵ Christ defeated Satan and all the army of demons and all his angels⁶ so that Christ's victory was full and perfect. The condemnation of the Devil and the deprivation of his power and sovereignty and men's deliverance from the Devil's tyranny, the "condemnation of sin and the abolition of the kingdom of death"⁷ are all inseparably connected with each other and are the results of Christ's victory over Satan and his angels. Man is no longer a slave of Satan. The power of sin has been destroyed.

The law of sin is now powerless for men because they have now received another power, the power of the Victor Christ, the power of His law which is the law of Love. The powerful Lord is and remains within men's hearts and His own power makes men powerful as well.

From all that I have said, we understand that Cyril does not separate

-
1. De Incarn. Dom. P.G. 75, 1433. "τοὺς δουλεύοντας αὐτῷ διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας".
 2. In Isaian 9, 1-3 P.G. 70, 247.
 3. In Isaian 13, 16. P.G. 70, 361. "οὐ μέχρι παντός ἡ τοῦ Διαβόλου τυραννὶς κατῆ-
/σχυσε".
 4. Ibid. Ibid.
 5. In Isaian 8, 4. P.G. 70, 224.
 6. Ibid. Ibid.
 7. De Incarn. Unig. P.G. 75, 1433.

the two ideas, Christ's victory and atonement. The whole problem of Law and judgement are connected with the free will of God, since as we have seen, men's deliverance was the eternal plan of God's free love.

There is no doubt that Cyril's Soteriology is strictly biblical. Not only does Cyril use the New Testament terms

, but also his ideas are the New Testament ideas and his teaching is the New Testament teaching about Salvation. Again, in Cyril's Soteriology we find the Old Testament teaching and the basic Soteriological terms Padah, Kipper and Gaal. As Professor T.F. Torrance points out Padah means Redemption by a mighty hand and in sheer grace out of the oppression of evil and out of judgement and death. This mighty hand is the holiness of Christ, His obedience unto death, His Blood shed freely on our behalf. Here, the stress is laid upon the nature of the Redeeming act. Kipper means Redemption by an expiatory sacrifice for sin made in the offering of Christ's Life for our life in obedience to the divine Will. Christ shed His Blood as a costly ransom or expiation, in order to remove the barrier of guilt and enmity between man and God and so to effect reconciliation in a holy Communion between them. Here the stress is laid upon the mode of the atoning redemption and on the restoration to fellowship with God. Gaal means Redemption through a Kinsman-Advocate, who acting out of a blood-tie or a covenant bond, or out of His pure Love stands in our place takes our lost cause on Himself as His sins, and makes sure our redemption in Himself, and so delivers us out of our bondage into the freedom of our inheritance in God. Here the stress is upon the

nature of the Redeemer and our Kinship with Him.¹ In Cyril's Soteriology, we find a synthesis of all these Old Testament ideas.

B' Man the New Creation in Christ

According to Cyril man's salvation was the purpose of Christ's Incarnation and His saving Sacrifice on the Cross.

Man becomes a new creation. New life starts, and this is the true and the real life, because man in Christ becomes real and true man.

Here I am going to present Cyril's understanding of man as a New Creation in Christ, of man as a being restored in Christ, in other words of the restoration of all gifts that men were given in the creation and that were either destroyed or obscured by and through sin.

(i) Destroying Satan's power, Christ made men really and truly free again and capable of doing good and avoiding evil.² The new Christian life is a life of true freedom. But this freedom should not be misunderstood. Freedom is true only when man uses it in freely doing good.

(ii) Christ as the Divine light illuminates the mind of man. Christ's grace as spiritual light restores man's image of God by faith.³ This Christian faith is, according to Cyril, the perfect expression of light;⁴ it illuminates man's mind and through perfect knowledge this faith leads man to understand Christ, to be united with Him and to be a real Image of God.⁵

-
1. T.F. Torrance. Uppfattningen om försoningen i urkyrkan. Kristi ämbete. p. 97. In Svensk Teologisk Kvartalskrift. 5. 1959. Lund.
 2. Resp. ad Tiber. 10, Pusey 3, 593.
 3. In Ioan. 3, 5. Pusey 1, 444.
 4. In Isaian 5, 1. P.G. 70, 1188-9.
 5. De Adorat. 8. P.G. 68, 545-48.

(iii) Christ in restoring man's nature and his gifts which were lost through sin, undoubtedly restored man's dominion and kingship. Man receives in Christ again a kingly honour.¹ Cyril distinguishes clearly between God's Kingship which is a matter of His own nature and essence² and man's dominion which is a gift to him³ and it is God who gives man this gift of dominion, which is considered as a gift of God's grace.⁴

However Cyril teaches that man's kingdom will be real in the eternal life. Because the world to come has been given to Christ.⁵

(iv) Cyril speaks also of man's incorruptibility as another aspect of the new creation. "As Adam was the cause of man's corruption and death, bodily and spiritually, so Christ as the second beginning stamped us with indestructibility."⁶ Christian salvation cannot mean simply only incorruptibility of body because in that case salvation would start only after death. Yet Christian salvation begins from this life, "God makes men participants of incorruptibility, because He makes them to share in His nature."⁷

(v) Christ, the only begotten Son of God the Father by nature came to fashion men to a real and new divine sonship, a divine adoption. Cyril believes that this divine adoption was the reason of the Incarnation of the Logos.⁸ Man becomes new in Christ the Son of God, not by nature but only by adoption, by Grace. That is why Cyril speaks of great differences between Christ as the natural Son of God and man as a son of God by grace in Christ. However, it was only through Jesus Christ that man was able

1. De Adorat. 2. P.G. 68, 244.

2. In Amos. 4. Pusey 1, 533.

3. In Ioan. 3, 1. Pusey 1374.

4. In Ioan. 11, 4. Pusey, 2, 665.

5. In Hebr. 2, 7-8. Pusey 3, 384.

6. In Genesim 1. P.G. 69, 28.

7. In Ioan 9, 1. Pusey 2, 487.

8. In Ioan 9, 1. Pusey 2, 482.

to be adopted again by God and to be a son of God, because the Son Christ fashions men to His own glory and stamps and engraves the distinctive mark of his own form on the soul of the participants.¹

Cyril explains these points in clearer passages;

"..... We rise to this supernatural dignity by reason of Christ. It is not, however, exactly as He is that we too shall be sons of God, but either in relation to him through grace, that is imitation.

The reason is that He is true Son sprung from the Father, while we are adopted sons from His loving kindness it is as a favour that we receive the: "I have said, you are gods and sons of the most high" Ps. 81,6 For the creature fashioned as a slave is called to the supernatural by the mere will of the Father... Nature and adoption, imitation and truth, are different ideas. Since, then, we have been called sons by adoption and imitation, we enjoy this blessing as favour or Grace not as a natural dignity."²

Our divine sonship achieved as it is through participation in the Son of God, is an image of the Son and consequently of the Father; it is the refashioning of our nature to the Divine nature in whose likeness man was created in the beginning. It is the communication of a prerogative properly God's which elevates us above human nature to the sphere of the Divine, and makes it possible for men to escape Corruption. Nevertheless, our sonship differs from Christ's. For Him, Sonship is inseparable from

1. De Trinit. Dial. 3. P.G. 75, 837.

2. In Ioan. 9. Pusey 1, 133-134.

His essence and He is Son par excellence, we are sons of God in imitation of Him, by God's uncompelled favour, a participation on our part, an adoption on His.¹

Cyril brings out another aspect of this teaching, our adoption has its origin in Christ's Incarnation. "The Logos emptied Himself in order to lift to His own height that which was lowly by nature, and He bore the form of a slave, though by nature He was Lord and Son, in order to transport what was slave by nature to the glory of adoptive sonship. He became like us in order that we might become like Him."²

Now we can understand how Christ is the "first-born of every creature", He is by nature Son but He invites all to become sons by grace.³ We have here two important points. Through His Incarnation, He makes His own what is man's and gives to man what is His own.⁴ And all this happened because of the union of humanity and Logos, and even more because that human nature has been restored and redeemed.⁵

When Cyril comes to examine this sonship of man, in detail he speaks of a process. Through the Incarnation men become brothers of the Incarnate Logos, of the Son, again not by nature.⁶ Now as brothers of the Son men become sons of the same Father by grace again, adopted sons of God.⁷ And then we receive the Holy Spirit, who dwells in us. It was this spirit that Christ as God gave to Himself as man in order that the human nature

1. Thesaurus 32, P.G. 75, 540 // also: Burghardt op. c. p.105-6.

2. 12, 1. Pusey 3, 122, 23.

3. Thesaurus 25. P.G. 75, 412.

4. In Ioan. 12, 1. Pusey 3, 122.

5. De Adorat. 8, 68 552.

6. Adv. Nester. 3, 2. P.G. 76, 125.

7. In Luk 2, 7. P.G. 72, 485.

might be able to receive the Spirit of God in Him.¹ And then Christ sanctifies men and makes them His own. Then men create new relations with God. And these relations are created either through the Holy Eucharist when men receive Christ's flesh, or through the coming and dwelling of the Holy Spirit within them. "How can our members be Christ's? We have Him within ourselves in a twofold way. He lives in us through His Spirit, but we also receive His holy flesh. And so we are sanctified, in a twofold way".

Because of this above-mentioned participation in the Divine Nature Cyril speaks of two stages in man's sonship. The first step is to be found at the moment of the Incarnation of the Logos. This can be considered as sonship in a general sense. The second stage is to be found in our personal participation in the Divine nature through the Holy Spirit and the Holy Eucharist. There is no doubt that the first stage of our sonship was the necessary presupposition for the second. Even in the second stage of the personal participation in the Divine nature Cyril insists that "men are not transformed into God's nature. They do not cast off their own."² Since men's sonship is a matter of participation,³ the participation implied the difference in natures.⁴

Here we are facing another question. Since man through Christ receives the "grace of adoptive sonship", would we say that Adam had not this kind of sonship? If it is so, how and in which sense could

1. In Ioan. 2, 1. Pusey 1, 185.

2. Thesaurus 12, P.G. 75, 200.

3. 2. Epist. ad Corinth 12, Pusey, In Ioan 3.

4. D. Trinit. Dial. 5. P.G. 79-965.

we say that man's salvation in Christ is really a restoration?

Cyril seems to admit that Adam had not the same kind of adoption as men receive in Christ. "All of us (and therefore Adam) are called the race and children of God, in as much as He is Father of all in that He engendered us by way of creation and brought into existence what did not exist."¹

In another passage Cyril speaks clearly and admits that man's life in Christ is far greater than the holy life of Adam.² In Christ men become true men. And it is in Baptism that Christ offers to men the grace of adoption and then men become sons of God in the real sense.

The Incarnation of the Logos is the link and reason of men's sonship. If Jesus Christ were not perfect man, He would not have been able to offer anything to human nature, because in this case He would have had nothing in common with this nature. Again, if He were not God then He would have not been able to make men sons of God and to give them His divine grace of adoptive sonship.

There is another point, too. It is the Son Who offers to us the grace of Sonship. Reasonable, simply because the image of the Son is sonship while the image of the Father should be fatherhood. We become sons.

"We have been sealed to sonship through the Son in the Spirit: for the Son's image is sonship, while the Father's is fatherhood. Therefore we are sons by sonship but we are God's image and likeness".³

1. In Ioan. (Fragm.) Pusey 2, 295.

2. De Adorat. 17. P.G. 68, 1076.

3. De Trinit. Dial. 3. P.G. 75, 837.

That is why Cyril admits that men have been made in the image of the Son who is the natural image of the Father, and so man is said to have been created in the image of God.¹

Finally Cyril writes that men resemble the one Divine nature and consequently all three Persons.² This is the conception of adoptive sonship as Cyril understands it.

-
1. De dogmat. solutione 4, In Pusey: Ioan. 3, 557-
 2. Burghardt op. c. p.123.

DIVISION II'. THE PERSONAL APPLICATION OF CHRIST'S SAVING WORK

First Section

The Divine Grace in the work of man's Salvation

Chapter One

The Divine Grace and Man's Salvation

A' Salvation, which Christ realized and offered, should be personally accepted by each one man. It is in this sense that we speak of Personal Application of Salvation.

Speaking of man's salvation, Cyril is absolutely certain that it is God in His grace who saves man. But the Divine Grace in spite of its universal character cannot really be opposed to the free will of man, who is able to accept or to reject the Grace that God offers.

That is why Cyril often, or nearly always, speaks of man's freedom, and insists that, "When one received the Holy Spirit through Baptism he is not at all deprived of his freedom, which on the contrary remains and exists".¹ So in the work of man's salvation the two factors are co-operating, first undoubtedly the Divine Grace and then man's free will. Both are inseparable. It is for this reason that according to Cyril man has "his own self-governing *αὐτοκυβερνῆσιν* with the D. Grace",² in the work of men's salvation. Therefore Grace does not act alone, or rather it does not act arbitrarily, does not do anything contrary to man's own will.

Now, since Grace co-operates with man's will, therefore man is responsible for what he is doing and for his future; either he is going to be saved or to be condemned.

1. C. Julian. P.G. 76, 1060.

2. In Ioan. 17, 12. P.G. 74, 524. "...τὴν ἰδίαν Προαίρεσιν συνεργάτην ὥσπερ Αὐτῇ / (τῇ Θεῷ Χάριτι ἔχειν)"

This idea leads to the conclusion that God does not predestinate absolutely anybody either to salvation or to eternal condemnation.¹ There is no doubt that God does not ignore those who are going to be condemned. In this case Cyril says that their condemnation is not due to God's Will. He insists, however, that their condemnation is not outside God's Eternal knowledge. Cyril speaks of God's foreknowledge about men's eternal future since, as we have seen in another chapter, for God there is no distinction between past, present and future, but there is only an eternal present.

So Cyril accepts a Relative Predestination in the sense that we have seen. God's grace does not limit man's will to accept or to reject what God offers.

In this co-operation of God's Grace and man's will undoubtedly the Divine Will is the first and main and the acting factor in man's salvation.² And even more, this relative predestination of God's part is eternal.³ Here Cyril says that men are "προεγνωσμένοι" by God the Father because they are σύμμορφοι of the Image of His Son.⁴

Referring to the epistle to the Romans about the election of Jacob instead of Esau, Cyril says that, if God had elected Jacob, He did not do that κατὰ πρόσκλησιν because God is not unrighteous. "God preferred Jacob because, foreknowing what was going to happen to both i.e.... Jacob and Esau, He loved the better one."

-
1. De rect. fid. ad Reg. 11. 9. P.G. 76, 1345.
 2. In Isaian 45, 11-12. P.G. 70, 965.
 3. In Rom. 8, 30. P.G. 74, 829.
 4. Thesaurus 11. P.G. 75, 176.

And therefore Jacob "ἤξλωτο κατὰ πρόγνωσιν ἀγάπης, μεμίσσηται δὲ δι-
καίως ὁ Ἰησοῦς. The same happened in the case of Jeremia whom as
Cyril says God knew before he was born and had sacctified because God
knew that he was going to be a prophet and good in his mission".

Then Cyril comes to the conclusion, that God had sanctified or
elected him κατὰ πρόγνωσιν Αἰτοῦ and not by His arbitrary Will, since
in this case God could not be a God of love and righteousness.¹ And
although Cyril admits strongly that the good desire for righteousness comes
from God, however he believes that the elected are elected "according both
to the Will of the One who called them and to their own Will. They
have been honoured to be elected and good, who have been pre-known as
going to become in time σύμμορφοι of Christ's life according to the measure
of their human nature."²

But because the flesh and the sinful desire resist the saving action
of the Divine Grace and man denies it, as Cyril says, there is need for
"a stronger and more intensive act of the Grace, so that man may be able
to look at God and be free from the ancient deceit".³

But generally the Grace does not act with force. In the case of
the condemned, God on the one hand negatively does not like their condem-
nation and does not judge them immediately, and on the other hand God
illuminates their mind, offers even to them His Grace which unfortunately
is rejected by them finally.

In the case of the redeemed ones God never acts with force, although

1. In Malach. 1, 3. 72, 281-284.

2. In Rom. 8, 28 and 9, 14, P.G. 74, 828, 836, 840.

3. In Luke, 14, 23. P.G. 72, 792. "...συντονωτέραν Κλήσιν καὶ ἐντονωτέραν
ἐνέργειαν τῆς Χάριτος, τὴν μεμονωμένης ἀνάγκης χρεῖαν, ἵνα ἰσχύσῃ ὁ ἄνθρωπος
ἀναβλέψαι πρὸς Θεὸν καὶ ἀποφειτῆσαι τῆς ἀρχαίας ἀπάτης".

as we have seen, their salvation is the work of Grace which makes man able to move towards repentance and to accept the offering of Grace.

So from the beginning to end in the work of justification and sanctification of man, the Divine Grace and the human Will go on as two parallel lines; the one never destroys the other. And when this work is fulfilled then God is glorified for His work but also man is rewarded for his co-operation with Grace for his moral perfection. Those who have succeeded the glorious life, which is full of good things, and who have been honoured to participate in Resurrection, will be superior to this earthly life; and will live as it is proper to those who are holy and are near to God. They are equal to angels, and as holy men worship God in Spirit.¹

God crowns only the "Lovers of Truth"² and honours each one's good things".³

And because Cyril speaks so strongly of man's will in the work of his perfection, that is why, as he says "it is a terrible sin and crime if one after his forgiveness through Christ, returns again to the life of sin, and does not try to avoid evil".⁴

Only if one tries to live according to God's Will he proves himself to be worthy of seeing God and to become a Mansion of the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity.⁵

It is for this reason that according to Cyril this world is a time of work and virtuous living and the future world is a time of 'Ανταποδόσεως'.⁶

1. In Luke 5, 27. P.G. 72, 892. "διαβιάσονται ὡς ἂν ἁγίοις πρέποι καὶ ἐγγὺς ἦδη

2. De Trinit. D. 4. P.G. 75, 859. /γεγόνασι Θεοῦ. 'Ισάγγελον γάρ εἰσι...".

3. De Adorat. 17, P.G. 68, 1104.

4. De Ador 15, P.G. 68, 996.

5. De Adorat. 14, P.G. 68, 941. "...ἄξιον τοῦ καὶ Θεοπτίας ἀξιοῦσθαι δεῖν καὶ ἱερὸν

6. In Matth. 24, 51. P.G. 72, 448. /γενέσθαι κατάλυμα τῆς Ἀγίας τε καὶ Ὁμοουσι-
/ου Τριάδος".

But because all men are sinners and weak that is why Cyril lays great stress on the great value of a true repentance which is "saving".¹

It is "Christ himself who calls all people to receive forgiveness of their sins through confession",² which means that Cyril considers very greatly the value and the importance of man's own wholehearted efforts in the work of his perfection. And man should always know clearly what he has to do because he has free will to do either good or evil and to be responsible for his own acts.³

And when man repents willingly, truly then God lives with him and forgives him and accepts him as His adopted son.⁴ According to Cyril it is virtue, in other words, man's own good efforts which makes us as images of God.⁵

However, it has to be always remembered that man cannot be saved only through his own virtue and works.⁶

That is why the co-operation of man's own will with the grace of God is necessary. But all men do not accept the grace of God equally. That is why not all people will be rewarded equally. There will be a difference of Rewards in the world of eternity according to the efforts of each one".⁷ I think that his passage is very characteristic of what I am trying to expound here about Cyril's teaching of man's free will in the work of his perfection.

B'. Cyril speaks of either the Grace of God who justifies men⁸ or of

1. In Isaian 59, 14. P.G. 1316.

2. In Psalm LXVI, 5. P.G. 69, 1141. "Ο Σωτήρ ἐλθὼν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐπὶ μετάνοιαν κα-
/λεῖ".

3. In Isaian. 22, 1-2, P.G. 70, 504.

4. In Aggaios 1, 13. P.G. 71, 1040. "Συμμεθίσταται ὁ...Θεὸς τοῖς μετανοεῖν ἡρημένοις".

5. In Luke 5, 29, P.G. 72, 597.

6. In Matth. 24, 51, P.G. 72, 448. "Μόλις ἀρχέσει πρὸς σωτηρίαν ἡ ἐκάστου ἀρετή".

7. De Adorat. 17, P.G. 68, 1125. "Διαφορὰ ὡςπερ ἐστὶ τῆς τῶν ἀγίων ζωῆς οὕτω καὶ
/γερῶν ἀναλόγως τοῖς ἐκάστου κατορθώμασι".

8. De Ador 7, P.G. 68, 504.

man's Faith which justifies him and makes him free from sin".¹ I think that Cyril wanted to express the same idea with both these phrases. It is God's Grace which justifies us, but God acting not κατ'ἀνάγκην does not save us unless we accept this gift, this grace.

That is why Cyril lays stress on the co-operation of God's grace and men's will when he says that "The Grace and Virtue combine us",² there is no real virtue without free will.

1. In Aggaïos 1, 5-6, P.G. 71, 1032. "Δεδικαιώμεθα διὰ πίστεως".

2. Thesaurus 12, P.G. 75, 205. "Χάρις ἡμᾶς καὶ ἀρετὴ συνάπτει".

Chapter Two

Universality of Christ's Saving Work

Since, as we have seen in another chapter, Cyril does not agree with the idea of absolute predestination, therefore he comes to the conclusion which is so important for Christian dogmatics, that Christ was incarnate and died for the salvation of all people, and not only for some. Cyril finds theological reasons for this teaching.

I. It was for the sinners that Christ died. "He Who is righteous died for the unrighteous; He Who is clean died for the dirty".¹

But there is no doubt that all people are sinners,² and that all die.³

Therefore all people need salvation and Christ offers Salvation to all people. "The Grace through Christ is brought to all"⁴ so that "all people may be saved and may find the truth".

II. God is the Shepherd of all people.⁵ Since He is "the Shepherd of all", He wants to save all His sheep.⁶

Because all people were enemies to God, "Christ's Cross becomes the only way through which all people again could find the Reconciling God, could come to the Father through Christ and come to the One Faith".⁷ God's love is limitless so He offers as a gift salvation to men.⁸

¹. Glaph. in Exod. 2, P.G. 69, 440. "ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτωλῶν, Δίκαιος ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων".

². Ibid

³. De Adorat, 2, P.G. 68, 260. "Πάντες ἀπεθάνομεν ἐν τῷ Ἀδάμ".

⁴. Ibid. "Εἰς πάντας ἡ διὰ Χριστοῦ φέρεται Χάρις".

⁵. In Ioan. 10, 11-13, P.G. 73, 1036. "Ποιμὴν ἐφ' ἅπαντας".

⁶. In Isaian 45, 20 P.G. 70, 981.

⁷. In Isaian 11, 13. P.G. 70, 332. "Το Χριστοῦ σημεῖον...πρόξενος γέγονε τοῦ συνε-

⁸. In Psalm. P.G. 69, 1153. /νεχθῆναι πρὸς ὁμοπιστίαν τοῦς ἀνά πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν".

Therefore His limitless love is extended to all people and it is because of this Love that "He bought us in His Own Blood".¹

III. Cyril finds another reason for the teaching of the Universality of Christ's redemptive work, too. As the second Adam Christ was the "second root of the mankind",² as we have seen. And Christ as the root is the root of the whole of mankind and therefore His saving work is not limited in any part but is extended to the whole of the mankind, whose root and beginning and Head is Christ.

Christ offered salvation to all people since all people are members of the whole of mankind. If a man eats bread or drinks water then undoubtedly these elements are not limited only to one part of his body but to the whole body and the whole body is fed and therefore grows.

Is it, however, certain that all people are saved? We have seen Cyril's answer to this question. His answer is that Christ offered objectively salvation to all people, but not all people accept the offering of Christ since He never acts with force. Therefore, not all people will be saved finally. That is why salvation is therefore real only for those who accept it i.e.: for those who accept the gift of salvation and who believe in Christ as Saviour and God. "To those Christ forgives all sins, offers His mercy, gives them His rich good things and forgives all that they have done",³ and opens the gates of the Heavenly Church⁴ to make them her members. It is for these reasons that according to Cyril Christ saved us objectively by offering His own Blood

1. In Isaian 53, 10. P.G. 70, 1189. "Ἠγόρασεν ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ Αἵματι τῷ ἰδίῳ".

2. In Genes. 3, P.G. 68, 172. "Πῶς τις ὥσπερ τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος ἀνέφυ δευτέρα".

3. In Mich. 7, 9, P.G. 71, 757. "τοῖς ἐπιστρέφουσιν εἰς Αὐτόν διανέμει..τόν ἔλεον".

4. Glapr. In Leviticon. P.G. 69, 545.

"τῆς ἀνω καὶ ἐν οὐρανοῖς Ἐκκλησίας ἀναγνύς τὰς θύρας τοῖς εἰς Αὐτόν πιστεύουσιν".

as "exchange" of the life of all people¹ and purchased the life of all² and "He gave Himself as Ἀντίλυτρον ransom for all, for small and great, wise and simple, rich and poor, Jews and Greek, and saved all men",³ without any exception. Therefore Christ called all people to salvation, namely people from all countries,⁴ of all classes,⁵ of both sexes,⁶ of all ages,⁷ of all places,⁸ generally all sinners.⁹ Christ died to free all human beings.¹⁰

The number of the believers always increases. The faithful people will never disappear completely, but from time to time new people will come to Christ some from the error of polytheism and others from Judaism, all sinners, and finally the crowd of the heathen will come to Christ.¹¹

Here it has to be said that it was absolutely easy for Christ to die for all people's salvation although He was only one, because He was the Incarnate Logos, He was God. It is for this reason that Cyril very often, nearly always in his writings, calls Christ "Saviour of all people"¹²,

1. Quod unus sit Christus P.G. 75, 1333. "Ἀπάντων ζωῆς Ἀντάλλαγμα".

2. In Ioan, 19, 40. P.G. 74, 68.

3. In Ioan 10-11. P.G. 71, 637. (πάντας διέσωσε Χριστός, δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ μικροῦ καὶ μεγάλου, σοφοῦ καὶ ἁσέφου, πλουσίου καὶ πένητος, Ἰουδαίου καὶ Ἑλλήνου.)

4. In Joel 2, 28. P.G. 71, 380.

5. In Joel 2, 28. P.G. 71, 380.

6. Ibid.

7. In Isaian 60, 8. P.G. 70, 1332.

8. Ibid.

9. In Matth. 2, 8. P.G. 72, 820.

10. In Isaian 53 4-6. P.G. 70, 11F6. "Ὅλην ἡλευθέρωσε τὴν ὑπ' οὐρανόν".

11. In Isaian 66, 22. P.G. 70, 1449.

12. In Isaian, 3, 9. P.G. 70, 108. "Σωτήρ τῶν ὅλων".

saviour of all of us", Saviour of all nations.¹ And Christ's grace is spread up even to the first root of mankind, i.e. to Adam.

There is something more here to say. Because Christ is not a mere man but perfect God, His sacrifice was not only sufficient for all men's salvation, but more than sufficient, super-sufficient. Christ was ὁ πάντων ἀντάξιός ,² and even more ὁ πάντων ἀνταξιώτερος ,³ so that Christ was able to free all the captives of Satan. The idea of a "limited calling" would limit the power and the perfect love of God.

And it was the Blood of this equivalent Christ that was shed for men's redemption. According to Cyril Christ offered objectively His Grace and salvation to all people and then every one should accept this salvation personally and subjectively if he wants to participate really in this salvation.

1. In Isaian. 40, 4. P.G. 70, 804.
2. In Isaian. 53, 10. P.G. 70, 1189.
3. In Isaian. 53, 4. P.G. 70, 1176.

Chapter Three

Justification of Man

It is true that justification of man is the centre of Christian soteriology. Therefore it is necessary to deal with Cyril's teaching about this great and so controversial problem of justification, because otherwise this thesis could not be complete at all. Here I deal with three main questions. 1) the preparation of man's justification. 2) essence and 3) the conditions of man's justification.

I) Preparation of man's justification.

God's Will is that all people may be saved, that is why God calls all people to salvation.¹ I examine this question in another chapter in detail. Here I shall say only that God's Grace is shown a) as General Grace in the sense that the Grace either in Baptism offers remission of sins and the seed of sanctification to the person who is baptized although this person does not become consciously a living member of the Church,² or acts generally within those who first time hear of Christ,³ and b) as Special Grace which acts strongly on those individuals who accept it and become conscious members of the Church.

Therefore the Κλήσις of man can be either external as a call through the preaching of the Gospel or internal as a call to each one individual. Both are acts of the preparatory Grace. God uses many and different means in order to call different people to salvation.

And man after being called by God, and after accepting this call goes

-
1. In Isaian 25, 7. P.G. 70, 561. "Ἡ ἐν Χριστῷ Χάρις...ἐπὶ πάντα γέγονε τὰ ἔθνη"
 2. In Psalm 50 (51), 12. P.G. 69, 1097. "ἡ διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου Βαπτίσματος Κάθαρσις πρῶτον"
 3. In Isaian 1, 16. P.G. 70, 40. /τεταὶ παραχρῆμα, δίδοται γὰρ ἡ Χάρις ἐν Χριστῷ".
- "Ἐπέλαμψεν ὁ Χριστός τοῖς ἔθνεσι καὶ κέκληται (ὁ κόσμος), πρὸς τὸ θαυμαστὸν Αὐτοῦ ἔως".

on to the next stage, i.e. to repentance and conversion and then he enters the new state of justification.

II) Essence of man's justification.

After being called by God to salvation, Man enters the new state of justification, and so is justified in Christ. This justification as a new state which the justified man enters, can be called Δικαιοσύνη and as an act of God for the manifestation and realization of this righteousness, is called Δικαίωσις .

Cyril very often speaks of man's justification, and there is no doubt that Cyril understands man's justification in its two aspects. In other words the Δικαίωσις forgiving man's sins and so destroying the power of sin and therefore the sinful state of man inaugurates within man a new life and state of sanctification and so the justified man becomes a new creation. That is why Cyril speaks of forgiveness of man's sins which presents the one, the negative aspect of justification, and of the new holy life, sanctification which presents the second, the positive aspect of justification. But both these aspects of justification, i.e. forgiveness of sins and sanctification are inseparable and both together express the whole essence of man's justification. That is why Cyril, speaking of justification, refers to both these aspects: a) forgiveness of man's sins and b) sanctification of man. "We come through the Holy Baptism to the Grace of Him Who sanctifies us and we receive forgiveness of sins, Spiritual Rebirth and and Συμμορφώσαντο Christ Himself.¹ Both are inseparable. None is first, nor is any given first from the other, so where there is forgiveness, there is the seed of sanctification.

¹. In Isaian, 3, 10. P.G. 70, 96. " Πρόσιμεν δέ καί τῇ διὰ τοῦ Ἁγίου Βαπτίσματος Χάριτι τοῦ ἁγιάζοντος ἡμᾶς ὕδατος τὴν ἰσχὺν εἶναι λέγοντες ἁμαρτιῶν ἀπόθεσιν ἀναγέννησιν τὴν πνευματικὴν εἰς συμμορφίαν τὴν πρὸς Αὐτόν τὸν Χριστόν ".

A'. Justification negatively: Forgiveness of Sins

This forgiveness is not only a mere covering of man's sins but a real destruction erasing sins. It is not a mere external decision but a reality. Sins are forgiven truly and really. God does not declare someone to be justified if he is not really justified, but God makes man *Δίκαιον* really. We can understand better this teaching if we remember the relation between Adam and Christ. As we became not only externally but really sinful because of Adam, so through Christ the second Adam, we become really justified. That is why Cyril uses the verbs *ἀπολούεσθαι* καὶ *ἀποτρίβεσθαι* πᾶν εἶδος ἁμαρτίας¹, *ἀποτίθεσθαι* καὶ *ἀποσμήχεσθαι* ἁμαρτίαν², *ἀπαλλάττεσθαι* μολυσμῶν³, *ἀπονίπτεσθαι* ἀπὸ ἁμαρτίας⁴, *ἐκτῆχειν* τὸν μολυσμόν⁵, *καθαροὺς ἀποφαίνειν* ἀπίσης ἁμαρτίας καὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων αἰτιαμάτων ἐλευθεροῦν⁶, like the fuller who makes the cloth clean, and does not only consider it clean. Grace and sin cannot exist at the same time together in the same person, but it is also absolutely certain that it is through the Grace that sin is really taken away. Sin goes away only when Grace comes in.

Through Baptism we receive the forgiveness of sin, we receive *Κάθαρσιν*⁷. Therefore man becomes really clean from all his sins. So forgiveness of sin is not only a mere matter of idea and opinion but a real fact of condition. Here it should be noted that according to Cyril through the

-
1. De Adorat. 11. P.G. 68, 752.
 2. I. Isaian 19, 1. P.G. 70, 453.
 3. De Adorat. 9. P.G. 68, 628.
 4. In Isaian 1, 16. P.G. 70, 41.
 5. In Ioan. 1. 26.
 6. De Incarn. Unig. 75, 1380.
 7. In Luke. 5, 21. P.G. 72, 649.

Baptism we receive not simply the remission of sins, but the forgiveness of all sins, of every kind of sins,¹

Cyril probably means both the actual and the original sin. Although it is certain that sins are forgiven, however, we have to remember that sin, having been done, cannot be now undone. But Δικαίως destroys what sin has created. As we have seen, sin has created a sinful state and guilt for man. Therefore, as Cyril says, justification erases both the guilt and the sinful state. a) Through the saving Baptism we obtain forgiveness of sins,² b) But through Baptism Christ releases us even from ἀρχαίων αἰτιαμάτων³, c) Through Baptism we are released even from all punishment of sin,⁴ d) Through the Baptism we are released from all μολυσμῶν of sin and from all κηλίδας τῶν πλημμελημάτων.⁵ Therefore when Cyril says that through Baptism we receive Remission⁶, he means that we become free from sin and from the results of sin. It is important to say here that according to Cyril we receive all these gifts "immediately".⁷ That is why the Baptism is really Σωτήριον.⁸ There is no doubt that the Baptism has this power because of the saving sacrifice of the Incarnate Logos. It is Christ who acts in and through the Baptism and Who through the Baptism offers to each one personally the gift of salvation which He as Theanthropos realized objectively and generally on the Cross. Although through the Baptism we receive forgiveness of sins, as we have

-
1. De Adorat. 11. P.G. 68, 752."...διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου Βαπτίσματος Πάν εἶδος ἀκαθαρσίας
 2. In Isaian 1, 16. P.G. 70, 41. / ἀποτριβόμενοι ".
 3. De Incarn. Unig. P.G. 75, 1240.
 4. " " " 75, 1240.
 5. De Adorat. 9. P.G. 68, 628.
 6. De Adorat. 14. P.G. 68, 933.
 7. In Psalm. 50 (51), 62. P.G. 69, 1097.
 8. De Adorat. 5. P.G. 68, 405.

seen it, however, even within the justified man a desire towards sin remains. This desire by itself is not considered as sin after the Baptism, but it is the power which leads man to sin. But we examined this problem in the first part of this Thesis.

B' Justification Positively: Sanctification of Man

In most of the above-mentioned passages, Cyril speaking of Baptism, speaks together both of forgiveness of sin and man's sanctification. Both are inseparable in Cyril's teaching.

Now speaking of man's sanctification as the positive aspect of justification, we have to distinguish it into two stages. The justified man at the moment of Baptism receives the seed of his Sanctification. By that Cyril means only a seed of sanctification, i.e. sanctification in a relative sense and not a complete sanctification. This is also what he means when he says that through the Baptism we receive spiritual Regeneration.¹ And it is in Baptism that we receive the Divine Grace through which we become rich, and καὶ τὸν τῆς ἐφροσύνης Χιτῶνα.²

So the Baptism gives power and helps us to go εἰς ὁδὸν τὴν ἀνωτικὴν³. Then the Baptism becomes the means for spiritual Blessing and offers grace and because of that we become temple of God.⁴ And even more through the Baptism we become participants of Divine Nature,⁵ since the Spirit dwells

1. In Isaian 3. 1-2. P.G. 70, 96. " Ἀναγέννησιν τὴν Πνευματικὴν ".

2. De Adorat. 11. P.G. 68, 752. " Τὴν ἐξ Οὐρανοῦ καταπλουτοῦμεν Χάριν ".

3. In Isaian 7, 3. P.G. 70, 196.

4. De Sanct. et Viv. Trin. P.G. 75, 1181.

5. Glaph. in Numbers. P.G. 69, 625. " Κοινωνοὶ Θεῖας Φύσεως ".

within us. All these gifts are given to the people who are baptized thanks to Him who invites men to salvation.¹

But man has to try and to co-operate with the Divine Grace for his progress in holiness, for his perfection. Therefore the very essence of sanctification is the gradual and complete moral transformation of man by avoiding sin and living a holy life in Christ. Although forgiveness of sins is offered equally to all people, the Grace is given to each one according to his faith. Cyril sometimes says that Grace is offered to those who are baptized and who have faith. But one could ask what happens in the case of the infants who cannot have personal faith.

Cyril does not examine this problem. However I believe that Cyril except some special historical reasons at his time when he had to speak about the Baptism of old men, he had in his mind probably the idea that Grace can act either when one accepts it willingly, or when one does not reject it willingly. The second happens in the case of the Infant Baptism. The seed of the new holy life offered to man, even if he neglects the work of his salvation, does not die but remains in him. Thus when he repents later for his actual sins, he has not to be baptized again in order to receive a new seed of sanctification, but through his repentance obtains again the vivifying power. Even in the state of his sanctification man remains man with the idiomata of his own nature. Human nature is not destroyed but sanctified. In the course of his sanctification man is always under the danger of falling and sinning. Man has both a certainty and uncertainty of his salvation; certainty

1. De Adorat. 9. P.G. 68, 628.

" Χάριτι καὶ φιλανθρωπία τοῦ καλοῦντος ἡμᾶς εἰς Σωτηρίαν ".

because of the truthful and powerful God who likes all people to be saved, and an uncertainty because of man's weakness.

In Cyril's teaching, the term sanctification has many meanings. It can mean man's consecration to the Holy God,¹ or man's preference to do God's Will,² and in this case it means a sacrifice of man's self.³ Here we should say that according to Cyril this positive aspect of man's justification, i.e. man's sanctification, makes him an Image of God in the general sense of the term image of God, as we have seen in the first part of this Thesis. "Christ has brethren like Himself, who bear the image of His Divine Nature by the way of sanctification; for this is the way in which Christ is formed in us, in as much as the Holy Spirit transforms us from what is human to what is His".⁴

Mainly man's sanctification in Christ is participations in the Divine Nature.

When the holy spirit communicates Himself to a creature, He makes the nature of that creature holy".⁵ To be without sin, as it is possible to man, and to be transformed to the Creator's image are two inseparable ideas.

This transformation and sanctification of man takes place in man not simply by the grace of God but through the Holy Spirit Himself, who "forms Christ in us", and who "renovates us to God".⁶ And the holy spirit is God. For that reason man's sanctification takes place not

1. De Adorat. 10. P.G. 68, 888.

2. Adv. Nestor. 2, 4. P.G. 76, 81.

3. C. Julian. P.G. 76, 593.

4. Adv. Nestor. P.G. 76, 129.

5. Burghardt. op. c. p.70.

6. De Trin. Dial. 7. P.G. 75, 1089.

simply through something like a ministerial grace, but as a participation in the Divine nature that the Spirit gives to those who are worthy.¹ This participation is not ontological.

So Cyril speaks of *Μόρφωσις* a quality of the soul; this means formation of Christ in man.²

For Cyril again this *Μόρφωσις* and, therefore, man's sanctification is possible only through a union of man with God. And undoubtedly this union is possible only if God allows us to find Him and to participate in His nature.³

However speaking of man's sanctification and holiness, Cyril distinguishes clearly between God's and man's sanctification. This holiness is natural to God, to Christ, while it is adventitious to men, it is introduced to man from outside, by means of the divine grace and a virtuous life.

"Holiness (or Sanctification) is deposition of any sin, being free from every spot of this world. And this belongs naturally to Christ, while it is introduced from outside to men by means of the Grace".⁴

For that reason holiness and sin are two very opposite things,⁵ and so sanctification in Cyril is "rubbing away or a getting rid of sin".⁶ But even this virtuous living is impossible without the help of Christ and it is Christ who helps to imitate the Holy God by good deeds and virtue.⁷ That is why Cyril, as we saw, speaks of man's

1. De Trin. Dial. 7. P.G. 75, 1088 / Thes. 43, 75, 597.

2. In Isaian 4, 2. P.G. 70, 936.

3. Burghardt. op. c. p.72.

4. In Ioan. 11, 9. Pusey 2, 716. "...ἀμαρτίας ἀποτριβή καὶ ἀπόθεσις".

5. In Rom. 8, 9-10. P.G. 74, 810.

6. Dial. de Trin. 6, P.G. 75, 1016.

7. C. Jul. 4, P.G. 76, 680.

sanctification as being by Grace.

The new gift that man receives in Christ, man's sanctification can be considered in two aspects, ontologically as 'Ἀγιασμός, in other words as a sharing in the nature of God through the participation in the Holy Spirit, and dynamically as 'Ἀρετή, in other words as a virtuous living. Both are inseparable. Sharing in God's nature man lives, according to God, holy life and ever more, man feels Christ within himself in so far as he participates in His nature and in so far as he lives according to Christ. This as a gift that can be understood only by people who are united with Christ and live in Christ and with Christ.¹

And then in Christ man is really transformed in a new holy life,² and in a new glorious life.³ Man becomes in Christ a new man, a New creation, a holy creation.

In Christ man has really returned through this sanctification to his nature's original beauty.⁴ Cyril explains this idea when he says that Christ freed men from sin and brought them back through sanctification to Kingly honour.⁵

Man becomes a new creation since "we are rich with the presence of Christ Himself within us".⁶ And Cyril does not forget that "participation in holiness is likeness to God"⁷ in the general sense.

Cyril explains that by holiness he means likeness to Christ in action,⁸ virtuous living,⁹ and finally the image of God's goodness.¹⁰

-
1. Ep. to Tiberious. 10, Pusey 3, 593.
 2. In Isaian 5, 2. P.G. 70, 1197.
 3. In Rom. 6, 5. P.G. 74, 796. "καὶ εἰς εὐχλεᾶ Πολιτεῖαν".
 4. In Isaian 4, 1. P.G. 70, 892.
 5. De Adorat. 2, P.G. 68, 244-5.
 6. De Rect. fide ad Theodos. 36, P.G. 76, 1188.
 7. In Ep 2 ad Corinth. 2, 1. Pusey In Ioan. 3, 326.
 8. In Ioan. 5, 5. Pusey 2, 72.
 9. In Ioan. 11, 9. Pusey 2, 716.
 10. Paschal Epist. 27, 2. P.G. 77, 936.

III) Presuppositions of Justification.

A) Man's justification on God's part.

Cyril has no doubt at all that man's justification is a work of God and of His Grace. "We are freely justified through the Grace of Christ and we have not offered anything as an exchange of our life, nor have we bought the glory of our freedom, but we gain this gift through the gentleness and philanthropia of our Lord".¹

In this passage Cyril speaks of man's justification as a gift of the Divine Grace. This saving Grace is characterized as Grace of Christ. Undoubtedly Christ's Grace is the same Grace of His Father and of the Holy Spirit as well. Having been justified by grace we do not offer or rather we cannot offer anything as an exchange for this great and unique gift. Man cannot offer anything to God, Man only receives from God who always offers. In another passage Cyril uses a very characteristic phrase in order to express this truth. So he says that we are justified by Christ's Grace.²

This grace of Christ is incomparably superior to the old Law which had condemned man. Here Cyril presents the great difference between the Old Law and Grace. "The Grace which justifies men is greater than the Law which condemned men."³ Christ offering His Grace gave an end to the Old Law.⁴ The law has now no power nor authority upon man who through Christ enter the new kingdom of Grace. No one can find the

1. De Adorat. 7. P.G. 68, 504. "Δικαιοῦμεθα δωρεάν διὰ Χάριτος τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ".

2. C. Julian. IX. P.G. 76, 968.

3. In Ioan. 3, 16. P.G. 73, 253. "Ἀμείνων ἡ δικαιοῦσα Χάρις τῆς κατακρινούσης ἐντολῆς".

4. De Incarn. Unig. P.G. 75, 1464.

"Δίδωσι τέλος τῷ Νόμῳ καὶ τὴν θύραν ὑπανοίγει τῆς Χάριτος".

Saviour and His kingdom without the illumination of God The Father. Like all the other good gifts man's justification comes as a gift from the Father, too. Cyril believes in this truth so strongly that he says that even the desire of man for his justification comes as a gift from the Father. That is why Cyril is certain that it was not the people who first tried and found Christ as the Divine Light, but God first manifested Himself as the Light to be seen by all people.

B) Justification on man's part.

Speaking about justification on man's part Cyril teaches that true faith is the condition for the personal application of the Divine gifts of Christ's sacrifice and therefore for obtaining justification.

"It is in Christ that our access (to God) is realized, and we who are infected (by sin) come near to God yet we are justified through Faith.."¹

This faith is characterized as "a knowledge of God"² This knowledge is true, not intellectual; through this knowledge we have the divine revelation within our hearts. This faith is a divine illumination of the man who repents for his sins and lives a holy life according to the Holy Will of God. Above all this Faith should be correct, unadulterated and blameless".³ That is why faith is connected with repentance. Therefore faith has a moral character, and it is not only a matter of man's mind. So faith is inseparable from Christian Love. Both affect each other mutually. Faith feeds love and is fed by love as well. Because faith and love -(works) are connected, salvation

1. De Adorat. 15. P.G. 68, 973. /// Glaph. in Genes. 6. P.G. 69, 328.

2. In Joan. P.G. 74, 125. " Ἰνῶσις Θεοῦ , Εἰδέναι Θεόν ".

3. Epist. 1. P.G. 77, 12.

" Ἐστω δέ ἡμῖν καί πρό γε τῶν ἄλλων ἡ Πίστις ὀρθή καί ἀκατήλεutos καί τό ἀνεπίληπτον ἔχουσα παντελῶς ".

seems to depend sometimes on faith alone¹ and some other times on the good works alone.

Consequently good works are necessary for the salvation of man, therefore man is justified by faith and his good works. " Διά τε τῆς πίστεως ὀρθῆς καί ἀγάπης εὐλκιρνοῦς .² Cyril lays so much stress on the importance of man's good works that he says that faith is useless and dead without these good works." Εἰδέναι Θεόν τόν ἕνα καί φθεῖν καί ὁμολογεῖν ἀδόλως τε καί ἀληθῶς, τοῦτό ἐστὶ πίστις, ἀλλὰ καί τοῦτο νεκρόν μὴ³ παρεπομένης αὐτῷ τῆς / ἐξ ἔργων φαιδρότητος." ³ That is why Cyril insists that all those who want to reach Christ should have correct faith and holy life according to the measure of human nature⁴. "Those who want to come (to God) need correct faith and then blameless life".⁴ And because the good works are necessary for man's salvation, they are characterized as being ἀξιόμισθα by Our Lord. Undoubtedly all good works of men are imperfect that is why their ἀξιόμισθα is relative only. For the above mentioned reasons Cyril speaks sometimes of Divine Grace which justifies and sometimes of Faith which justifies man. The reason can be found in the fact that it is God who saves men but man has to accept personally salvation, which God offers to him, otherwise man cannot be saved, not because God does not save man but because man rejects his salvation. God never acts by force nor by necessity. I examine this important point in another chapter.

1. De Adorat. 15. P.G. 68, 973.

2. In Joan. 15, 1. P.G. 74, 344.

3. In Joan. P.G. 74, 125.

4. In Luke. P.G. 72, 776.

" Τοῖς ἐθέλοσιν ἐλθεῖν δεῖ δὴ πάντως Πίστεως καί πρό γε τῶν ἄλλων ὀρθῆς· εἴτα βίου ἀλήπτου κατὰ γε τὸ μέτρον τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης δικαιοσύνης ".

Chapter FourSanctification of Man.

Cyril often speaks of man's sanctification in Christ and his new life. And when he comes to examine this question in detail, he apparently speaks of two ways¹ in which man receives sanctification.

I. Cyril refers to the first way when he speaks of the 'Indwelling of the Holy Spirit' within man, and, in general, of the very fact of the Incarnation through which man, is elevated, glorified and sanctified, by being united with God, and being *Σόσωμοι* with Christ through a mystical *Εὐλογία*. The Holy Spirit sanctifies man and makes him God-like.²

II. Cyril speaks of another way, as well, in which man can be united with Christ and really vivified. Christ loves us and offers His Grace not only by sending to us the Holy Spirit but also through His vivifying Flesh which He offers in the Holy Eucharist for our life and sanctification.³ So the second way is the Holy Eucharist.

Thus Cyril speaks of man's twofold sanctification through both the Holy Spirit and Christ's Flesh. It is for this reason that Cyril speaks of a twofold indwelling of Christ within us. The Son dwells within us (firstly) as a man in a bodily way and is united with us through the mystical blessing, and (secondly) as God in a spiritual way He leads to a new life through His Spirit and Grace,⁴ so that we can have Christ within us both *αἰσθητῶς καὶ νοητῶς*.⁵

1. Glaph in Genes. 1, 1. P.G. 69, 29.

2. " " " " P.G. 69, 26.

3. De Rect. Fid. ad Theod. 380. P.G. 76, 1189.

4. In Ioan 17, 22. P.G. 74, 564.

5. I ad Corinth. 6, 15, P.G. 74, 869.

I' Participation of the Holy Spirit

It is one of the most important points of Cyril's teaching that men receive and have the Spirit. God $\chi\rho\iota\varsigma$,¹ anoints men with the Spirit, God offers the Spirit to all those who accept Him. The Apostles received Him first². Christ offers the Spirit not only to the Apostles but to all believers. It was necessary that we should become partakers and sharers of the Divine nature of the Logos, or rather that, giving up the life that originally belonged to us, we should be transformed into another, and the very elements of our being be changed into newness of life well pleasing God. But it was impossible to attain this in any other way than by fellowship with an partaking of the Holy Spirit.... (The Lord) present in the body with those who believed in Him, He showed Himself the source of every blessing. But when time and necessity demanded His going to His Father in heaven, it was essential that He should associate Himself by the Spirit with His worshippers and should dwell in our hearts by faith in order that having His presence within us, we might readily advance in all virtue and might also be found strong and invincible against the wiles of the Devil, and the assaults of men, as possessing the omnipotent Spirit.³

Here Cyril clearly refers to the partaking of the Holy Spirit as the means for obtaining grace and power and blessing.

Cyril mentions some concrete ways in which men receive the grace of the Spirit. Holy Baptism is the main way⁴ that we receive fully Christ

1. De Rect. fid. ad Theos. c. 37. P.G. 76, 1188.

2. In Joel 2, 28. P.G. 71, 376.

3. In Ioan. 15, 7, P.G. 74, 433.

4. Glaph. in Exod. 1, 2, P.G. 69, 432.

and become children of God¹: In Baptism Cyril sees a twofold healing.

Because man consists of two elements, body and soul, the water of the Baptism sanctifies the material body and the Spirit sanctifies the human soul.²

Men also receive the Holy Spirit through a true repentance.³

Through this participation in the Holy Spirit men become partakers of the Divine nature.⁴ In his works Cyril calls the grace either as God's grace in general,⁵ or as the grace of Christ⁶.... or as the grace of the Holy Spirit, as the shedding of the Holy Spirit within our hearts.⁷

In this case, there is no doubt that the Divine grace is one though it can act in different ways.

Cyril speaks of grace either as grace in the sense of an eternal desire of God for offering His grace or as the manifestation in time of the eternal Εἰδοξία of God, although both are different aspects of the one and the same grace of God.

The salvation of men and the dwelling of the Holy Spirit in them are two inseparable truths. And when the Spirit dwells within men then they become Πνευματοφόροι⁸, Θεοφόροι⁹, vessels of the Holy Spirit¹⁰ who seals them for salvation¹¹ and justification. When Cyril speaks of God's

1. In Rom. 1, 3. P.G. 74-776.

2. In Ioan. 3-5, P.G. 73, 244.

3. In Js. 57, 10. P.G. 70-1268 In Ioan 20, 22 74, 721.

4. In Ioan. 20-22, P.G. 74-712.

5. Thesaurus. 15, P.G. 75, 292. "Κλήσει ἁγία κεκλήμεθα, κατὰ Χάριν Θεοῦ ..".

6. In Isaian 2, 6. P.G. 70, 76 // In Rom. 5, 15. P.G. 74, 785. "Χάρις Χριστοῦ".

7. Thes. 34. P.G. 75, 597. "ἡ Χάρις... ἡ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος χάρις ἐν ταῖς

8. Thes. 34. P.G. 75, 576. / καρδίαις ἡμῶν ".

9. Adv. Nest. 1, 4. P.G. 76, 172.

10. In Ioan. 5-35, P.G. 73, 401.

11. In Ioan. 16, 8. P.G. 74, 437.

dwelling in men, he means no doubt the whole Holy Trinity, all the Three Divine Persons.¹ And undoubtedly the Holy Spirit is able, as perfect God, to offer grace to men but because there is only one will and decision among the Three Persons of the Holy Trinity, Cyril refers to the whole Holy Trinity, saying that the Son with the Father and the Spirit dwell within men² and All three act for men's salvation. In this sense we can speak of the inter-relation among the Holy Trinity in dwelling in men. All three Persons do not dwell as one Person but as Three in Oneness,³ while the Three Persons dwell within men. Each one however is related to a special way of working for men's justification.⁴ The Father dwells as Father and the Son as Son, although their basic common point is that all three are One in nature and substance.

Cyril has no doubt about the reality of the dwelling of God in man, about the relation and unity between man and God. But when he comes to examine this question theologically then he teaches and insists that there is a great and basic difference between this unity of man and God on the one hand and the two natures in Christ on the other hand. The first is relative unity⁵ and spiritual - moral, the second is natural unity, because in the case of the Incarnate Logos each of His natures does not exist individually and separately but both constitute one Person, while in the other case each part, God and man, exists individually, and does not lose his own personality. Man does not cease being man, nor does God cease being God. Again man, in his unity with God, does

1. Quod unus sit Christ. P.G. 75, 1316.

2. Thes. 8, P.G. 75, 108.

3. Ibid.

4. In Ioan. 15, 1. P.G. 74, 333.

5. In Ioan. 15, 1. P.G. 74, 333.

not become God, i.e. of the same substance with God¹ but has God being and living within himself.² However this unity is an inner communication between God and man. God lives and remains really within man and that is why Cyril can speak of *Συνάφεια*, ³*Κόλλησις* ⁴.

In this sense Cyril uses even the term Unity.⁵ This unity is not a mere external relation but a real, deep, inner unity.

It is in this relative sense that man is said to become God since God the Holy Spirit living within man deifies him and makes him partaker of Divine nature.⁶ This is the meaning of the verb *Ἀποθεοῦν* in Cyril.⁷

The work of the dwelling of the Divine Grace within men to to make them clean from their sins and to justify them and to lead them to a new life in God.⁸ So grace and justification are inseparable. This happens in Baptism when, as we have seen, we get freed from our sins and become partakers of the Divine nature.⁹ The forgiveness of sins only in this sense is to be understood. And as seen in another chapter, when Cyril speaks of man's justification he means that God, forgiving man, not only considers him as justified but God makes him really righteous, justified,¹⁰ although man is sinful¹¹.

This forgiveness of sins is the basic step or stage in the work of man's justification. The forgiveness is not only an external covering of man's sins but a real cleaning of the whole man, of his body and of his

-
1. Apolog. ad Theod. 3, P.G. 76, 408.
 2. Ibid.
 3. Thes. 34, P.G. 75, 597.
 4. Glapl. in Exod. 1, 3. P.G. 69, 497.
 5. Thes. 34, P.G. 75, 605.
 6. In Ioan. 5-18, P.G. 73, 348.
 7. Ep. 40. P.G. 77, 200.
 8. In Malach. 33, P.G. 72, 336.
 9. De Adorat. 1, 11. P.G. 68, 752.
 10. In Js. 51, 1-2; P.G. 70, 1104-5.
 11. In Osie. 1, 3. P.G. 71, 32.

soul from his sins.

Because in Baptism man receives forgiveness his sin need not be forgiven any more. A new state begins, the state of sanctification,¹ which is not a mere intellectual or a mere moral state, but it is the state of real sanctification of the whole man, of his soul and body, so that man becomes a new man, another man.² Man does not remain in the same state of holiness but he always is progressing in virtue, going always towards higher stages of holiness. It is in this sense that Cyril uses many equivalent words - terms, ἀναμορφοῦσθαι,³ μετασχηματίζεσθαι,⁴ μετακλάνεσθαι - μετάκλῃσις,⁴ μεταστοιχειοῦν,⁵ ἀνακλάνεσθαι - ἀνάκλῃσις.⁶

Now, we can understand that for Cyril grace means the supernatural and saving love, power and act of God through which the personal application of the redemptive work of our Saviour is obtained and which forgives all sins, strengthens man for spiritual fights and realizes the "new creation" within man, and which is therefore manifested in the conversion, the justification and the holiness of man. Of the supernatural and divine character and not human character of the grace Cyril says that "though the Spirit ἀναβαίνομεν εἰς τὸ ἀρχέτυπον τῆς εἰκόνης σχῆμα" καὶ "εἰς τὸ ὑπὲρ φύσιν ἀξίωμα" "τὸ ἀρχαῖον τῆς φύσεως κάλλος ἀναχομιζόμενοι καὶ πρὸς τὴν θείαν ἀναμορφούμενοι δόξαν."⁷

Referring to the question of the necessity of the grace, in his comment on Luk. 14, 23. "nobody can come to me if my Father does not

1. Pasch. Hom. 10. P.G. 77, 617.

2. In Js, 54. 4, P.G. 70, 1200.

3. In Ioan. 3, 5. P.G. 73, 244.

4. Hom pasch. 10, P.G. 77, 621.

5. De Trin. Dial. 7, P.G. 75, 1113.

6. In Zachar. 13. P.G. 72, 229.

7. In Ioan. 1, 12. P.G. 73, 133.

take him," Cyril says that this phrase shows men's calling to salvation as a work of the Divine power.¹ And in another passages justifying the necessity of grace in the work of man's salvation, Cyril says that "because man's nature is not so strong nor can it alone abandon evil completely, God is co-fighting with man (against evil) and gives to man a two-fold grace, by trying to persuade man, by helping him and so making him stronger than evil."²

Now with regard to the universal character of the grace of God who offers richly and abundantly, nobody has remained without this gift." And in order to explain what he says, he refers to the prophet Joel who says: "I shall shell out my spirit to every man". But if not all men receive the grace, that happens because "each one himself is responsible for accepting or rejecting this Divine gift."³

II' The Holy Eucharist

Speaking of the communication of the Divine grace to believers Cyril often refers to the Holy Eucharist, through which man participates in God and receives Him in a new mysterious but real way.⁴ Through this Sacrament man obtains a new relation inner and real, with God the Son.

Although Cyril has not written any special work on the Eucharist,

1. In Luk 14, 23, 72, 792.

2. De adorat A. 68, 173.

3. In Ioan 14, 19 74, 264.

4. In Ioan. 6, 54. P.G. 73, 580.

it is however easy to find out his teaching as far as this subject is concerned.

I find three important Christological points as necessary presuppositions for the soteriological understanding of the Eucharist in Cyril's teaching.

1. The body of Christ is not the body of a mere and common man.

His body, which is a life-giving body, is the Body of God, of the Incarnate Logos. Otherwise this flesh could not have the power of life-giving.¹

2. For Cyril there is no doubt that Christ's body is life-giving flesh, but undoubtedly the flesh of Christ is not life-giving by itself but only because of its union with the Divine Logos, and so it is from the Divine Logos that Christ's Flesh receives this power.²

What I say here could not be true unless the hypostatic union of the nature in the one Person of Jesus Christ were real.

3. It is true that through the Eucharist man receives Christ, not only His grace but Christ himself, His body and His blood. Cyril lays much stress on this point. He teaches that the bread in the Holy Eucharist is not only a simple *Typos* of the body of the Christ, but it is the Body of Christ and the wine is the Blood of Christ. The Bread and the Wine do not receive just only a blessing to become life-giving but both really change and become the Body and Blood of Christ, by the power of God.³

Because in the Eucharist the Body of Christ is offered to the

1. Quod unus sit Christus. P.G. 75, 1360.

2. Epist. 17. P.G. 77, 121.

3. In Matth. 26, 27. P.G. 72, 452. // also In Ioan 6, 64. P.G. 73, 601.

believers, it is called a real spiritual Meal, a spiritual Blessing.¹ Although it is Christ who gives life to men, however Cyril admits that the Holy Spirit does the same, too.²

Though Cyril is absolutely certain that the change of the gifts takes place by the power and the blessing of God, however, he does also say that the way in which the change takes place remains mysterious and unknown to men. We have to accept it by faith in silence.³

Besides this mystery of the real change of the gifts, Cyril sees another mystery, i.e. the fact that the Body of Christ is not lessened while it is broken and offered at the same time to countless people in all parts of the world. At the same time Christ is present everywhere, where the Eucharist is celebrated.⁴ And even more, when Cyril says that the body of Christ is present in all places at the same time, he means that the whole Christ is present in each place and is all.⁵ The one and individed Christ is present in each and all Eucharists at the same time in different places.

This teaching is very important soteriologically. All people and not only some, participating in the Eucharist can receive Christ. This confirms the doctrine of universal salvation, in other words for the salvation of all people of all places and of all times.

The main soteriological significance of the Holy Eucharist is to be found in the fact that Christ enters and lives within the participants, Christ through His flesh comes and lives within the whole man.⁶

1. In Matth. 26, 27. P.G. 72, 452.

2. Apolog. against Orient 11. P.G. 76, 376.

3. Apol. c. Orient. 11. P.G. 76, 376 // Also. In Ioan. 6, 54. P.G. 73, 604.

4. Hom. div. P.G. 77, 1029.

5. In Ioan. 19, 23. P.G. 74, 660. "ὁλοκλήρως καὶ ἀμερίστως ἐν ὅλοις ἐστὶν Εἷς

6. In Ioan. 6, 55. P.G. 73, 581. /ὑπάρχων πανταχῇ".

Then Cyril speaks of a special inner relation and unity between Christ and man. Receiving His flesh man becomes one with Him and lives and is in Him.¹ Cyril uses the characteristic verbs *Συν-ανακρίνασθαι*² and *Ἀνακεραννύναι*³ in order to show this inner union of man with Christ. In his comment on John's Gospel 6, 57, Cyril shows that as the yeast exists and is mixed with the whole dough so Christ lives with men and is united with men and as the yeast is the reason for the fermentation of the whole dough, so Christ is the cause of the efficacy of the Eucharist and therefore the cause of the grace and life and sanctification of the communicants.

However there is here a real danger which Cyril apparently avoids. When he speaks of the unity of man with Christ he means "spiritual but real one. In other words man does not cease being man, he does not lose his nature, nor does God become a mere human being by changing His nature. Cyril calls this unity *Μετάληψις*,⁴ *Μετοχή*,⁵ *Μέθεξις*.⁶

Christ unites man with Himself and offers all blessing, Cyril uses the verb to implant⁷ or to put in,⁸ in order to show that Christ lives within man.

Christ's living within the communicants is not aimless. Cyril asserts that Christ's body becomes seed vivifying for men,⁹ since men become participants of Christ's Divine human nature. This is the great

1. In Luk. 22-19, P.G. 72-109. "Ἐν πρός Αὐτόν ἀποτελούμενοι".

2. In Matth. 26, 27. P.G. 72, 452.

3. In Ioan. 6-118, P.G. 73, 561.

4. Glaph in Exod. 1, 2. P.G. 69, 213.

5. De Adorat. 1, 2, P.G. 69, 428.

6. De Adorat. 1, 6, P.G. 68, 417.

7. In Ioan. 6, 62, P.G. 73, 581. "Ἐμφυτεύειν".

8. In Ioan. 6, 55. P.G. 73, 581. "Ἐντιθέσθαι".

9. In Luk. 22, 19, P.G. 72, 912. "Σπέρμα Ζωοποιόν".

privilege for men who receive the Divine Blessing which makes them to participate in God's incorruptibility. The water by its nature is cold. But when we put it in a hot pot, it becomes hot, too. Men are corrupted because of sin, but being united with the incorrupted God, they become incorrupted, too. In this case Cyril uses the accurate verb, 'Αναστοιχειόμεθα .¹

Again since God is life, men through the Eucharist receiving Christ receive real life; they become participants of God's life.² And even more men through the Eucharist receive Christ as the unique Power which is a sanctifying power, which leads men to holiness, and which makes men able to live a holy life.³ Men's life will be undoubtedly eternal. That is why Cyril speaks of the Holy Eucharist as bringing immortality, as a seed of immortality.⁴ So Cyril speaks of the bodily Incorruptibility as a reward to those who receive the Flesh of Christ within themselves.⁵ Christ will destroy the death of the human flesh of those who receive Christ as their life.⁶ All communicants will die bodily death here on earth; it is however also certain that the Eucharist becomes a seed and a medicine of incorruptible life in the world of the eternity.⁷ Cyril has no doubt that bodily incorruptibility is a supernatural gift of God to men through the Holy Eucharist. And this gift of grace can be understood and accepted only by those who can believe.⁸

To those who believe the Eucharist becomes the abolition of our

-
1. In Ioan. 6, 54. P.G. 73, 580.
 2. In Ioan. 6, 53. P.G. 73, 577.
 3. In Matth. 26, 27. P.G. 73-452 = In Ioan. 6-54, P.G. 73, 577.
 4. In Ioan. 6, 55. P.G. 73, 581." Σπέρμα τῆς 'Αθανασίας ".
 5. In Ioan. 6, 48. P.G. 73, 561.
 6. In Ioan. 6, 54. P.G. 73, 580.
 7. In Ioan. 6, 48. P.G. 73, 561." Ζήσκειν μέλλοντες ".
 8. In Ioan. 6, 59. P.G. 73, 596.

weakness.¹ And both weakness and death are abolished. Their elimination will be final in the world of eternity.

After all that we have seen it is easy to see Cyril's understanding of the great significance of the Holy Eucharist which for him is not only a mere ceremony but a real offering, a bloodless offering,² which is real because of the reality of Christ's Cross on Golgotha.

It is Christ who is offered in the Eucharist,³ but it is also the same Christ who offers and fulfills the Sacrifice in the Eucharist. Thus He is the offerer, the priest, and the victim.⁴ Christ as the origin of mankind fulfills the offering in His real body, but also in His mystical body and so He makes the members of His mystical body to be offered to Him and live and be united with Him.

1. In Ioan. 6, 17, P.G. 73, 585.

2. In Isaian 25, 6. P.G. 70, 561.

3. In Luk. 22, 14. P.G. 72, 905.

4. Hom. div. P.G. 77, 1029.

Second Section

The Ark of Salvation - The Church

The whole Soteriology is inevitably united with the doctrine of the Church, because, as we shall see, the Church is the Divine Institution of Salvation, is the Ark of Salvation. Here I am presenting very briefly Cyril's teaching about the Church and Her significance in the work of man's salvation.

Cyril has no doubt that Christ Himself founded this Church as a perfect Institution.¹ Therefore the Church was not founded by any men but by God Himself." 'Ο Χριστός (συνέστηκε) τό σῶμα αὐτοῦ...τήν Ἐκκλησίαν "I

The Church is a community of people who are united through the same correct faith and love.² The sense of the Importance of the Community is carried forward into the New Israel, the Church.³ She is not a mere natural but a spiritual unity⁴ which came to exist because of Christ's redemptive work and of the power of the Holy Spirit. The day of Pentecost was the official moment of her Inauguration, although She appeared first in Christ. That is why the Church cannot be understood apart from Christ and it is for this reason that Cyril calls Her "The Church of Christ"⁵ or "The Church of God."⁶

This Church was prefigured in the Old Testament.⁷

The Church is a spiritual purpose, the salvation of man, and uses

1. I ad Cor. 12, 9. P.G. 74, 888.
2. Karmiris J. The Ecclesiology of Sts. Basil, Gregory the theologian and Chrysostom. Athens 1962. p.51.
3. McIntyre J. On the Love of God. London 1962 p.128.
4. In I ad Cor. 12. P.G. 74, 888. "νοητήν ἐνότητα..".
5. In Matth. 16, 16. P.G. 72, 424. "Ἐκκλησία Χριστοῦ".
6. I Corinth. 1, 1. P.G. 74, 857. "Ἐκκλησία Θεοῦ".
7. Glaph. in Genes. P.G. 69, 552.
"Μία ἡ Ἐκκλησία, καθότι καί πάλαι ὁ Ναός, μία δέ καί ἡ θνητή, τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τό κάλλος ὡς ἐν τύποις ἐστὶ προαναφαίνουσα".

spiritual means, the Divine Grace and the Holy Mysteries. The boundaries of the old Church were confused or even identified with the national boundaries while the New Testament Church is universal, invites all people.¹ The old Church used to accept her members by their natural birth, while one becomes a member of the New Church only through Baptism and spiritual Birth. The old Church was not able to clean the soul of man; that happens only in the New Testament Church. The old one was a worship of types and symbols, the new one is the fulfilment of the symbols and the reality.

The Church is the spiritual House² and Institution which is not only founded by God but is also continuously preserved by Him.³ Christ invites men to become members of His Church and then He keeps them with the Holy Sacraments. By Baptism we become members of the Church and participants of death, resurrection and life of Christ, who is the Head of those who through the one faith and the same Sacraments are united with Him and constitute one Body. He is the Head and is the vivifying centre from which life is offered to all members and because He is the link which unites them all. Cyril expresses the same idea when he calls Christ "corner stone" which unites and keeps the whole organisation of the Church.

The new life is offered to the members of the Church from the Father, through the Son, in the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit is the Power and the Soul of the Church,⁴ which therefore as a whole is not subject to

1. In Zach. 2, 1 - 5. P.G. 72, 33.

2. In Isaian. P.G. 70, 344.

3. De Adorat. 9, P.G. 68, 589.

4. I Cor. 12, 9. P.G. 74, 888.

errors or mistakes, and thus is infallable. Those who leave the Church sin, because they refuse the basic doctrines of the Church, participate in the sacrifices of the heretics,¹ or they refuse even Christ at all, or they do not live a life proper to holy ones. That is why the members of the Church are the holy ones of all generations.

Now, since the Church is a community of living and visible members, the visible character of the Church is undoubtful. It is in this sense that Cyril characterises the Church as a high mountain, as a House of God, or Sun and Moon or Island visible by all.² The Church as a Body is a concrete whole with many units, members, although some of them are holy and some sinful. All these constitute one visible Body. The Church is, on the one hand, visible because of the human elements, but, on the other hand, the Church has also a strong, invisible character, because of her invisible Head, Jesus Christ, the Divine Grace, and because of the secret and eternal Plan of God for the work of His Church. The visible and invisible elements of the Church are inseparable. Because of this unity the Church is a subject of faith. The invisible aspect presents the Church as the mystical Body of Christ through which He continues His Incarnation and His saving Work through the Holy Spirit and offers Grace and the gifts of His Cross to each individual. The visible aspect presents the Church as a community of people, who commonly recognise Christ as their God and Saviour, who live according to His Will and who commonly worship Him.

1. In Osie 8, 12. P.G. 71, 209. οἱ τοῖς...αἱρετικοῖς συναπτόμενοι...ἔξω θόουσι

2. In Sophon. 2, 12. P.G. 71, 981.

/.τῆς Ἐκκλησίας".

Since the Church is Christ's Mystical Body through which He continues His redemptive Work to each individual, the Church, with Christ, has the same purpose. Thus The Church is an Institution of Salvation,¹ in other words, she keeps and spreads the true light of Christ everywhere, and offers the gifts of the Cross to the world. So she is the Ark of Grace and Salvation. And it is in this sense that where the Church is, there Christ is, too. The Church is the only Ark of Salvation, and therefore one should belong to the Church in order to receive Grace and Salvation. That is why Cyril calls the Church the ship which alone can lead the members, the believing people, safely to the Kingdom of Heaven. "We say that the Churches of Christ are like ships in this world but which are really above this world. These ships cross the sea (of this world) and transfer the believers to another pure land, i.e. to the Heavenly Kingdom. So the Church is a ship and those who are within Her are the holy ones".²

Here it may have to be said that Cyril speaks of "The Church of Christ" and then he refers to the One true universal Church of Christ on earth, or of "Churches of Christ" and then he refers to local extension of Christ's Church, i.e. he refers to several local Churches which are members of the One true Church. A local Church can not be a true part of the true Church unless it has the correct and the one same faith of the One true Church. This teaching does not exclude the cases in which God is not limited but can spread His Grace as He wills.

The Church is characterised by Cyril as One.³ She is one because of

1. Karmiris J. Synopsis of the dogmatical teaching of the Orthodox Cath. Church. Athens 1960, p.77.

2. In Psalm 103. P.G. 69, 1264. "Πλοῖα εἶναι φημέν τὰς Ἀγίας τοῦ Σωτῆρος... Ἐκκλησίας

3. De Adorat. 13. P.G. 68, 880.

her unity which depends on the One Head, Christ, on the one vivifying Spirit, on the one Faith, one Baptism, on the one Love.¹ Cyril says that "Christ is said to have been a perfect Stone which has been laid as the Foundation of the Sion i.e. of the Church. We stand upon Him and through Faith we become a Spiritual House, a Holy Temple, a House of God in Spirit".² So the Church is one Stone, one House. And this unity, in spite of the many members and of the local Churches, is the more essential character of the Church. This unity is manifested as unity in faith³ and unity in the same Sacraments of the Church.

In Cyril's teaching the Church is also called Holy because her Head, God, is holy, and the Holy Spirit, who keeps her in the truth, is Holy⁴ God Himself sanctifies her.⁵ The Church uses for the sanctification of the members, the Sacraments, which are holy. Even the members of the Church are called by God to be Holy. There is no doubt that in the Church there are some members who are not holy, who, however, can become so. As Cyril says, the Church is called 'Sion'⁶ because she is "Tall" and she is holy, since she is the House and City of the most Holy God, and because of Her high dogmas.

"The mountains are decorated with many trees, and the Church of Church has many heads of saints".⁷

The Church is also Catholic. By this term Cyril means the extension

-
1. De Adorat. 9. P.G. 68, 633. "ἐν πάσαις ταῖς Ἐκκλησίαις εἷς Κύριος, μία Πίστις"
 2. In Isaian. P.G. 70, 344. "Ἀίθεος ἐκλεκτός ὁ Χριστός, αὐτῷ ἐπερηρεώμεθα... καὶ"
 3. De Adorat. 9. P.G. 68, 633. "ἐποικοδομούμεθα οἶκος Πνευματικός εἰς Ναόν Ἁγίον"
 4. Glaph in Genes. I.5. P.G. 69, 29.
 5. Glaph in Genes. 2. P.G. 69, 89.
 6. In Isaian. P.G. 70, 344.
 7. In Obdiou 17, in Amos 9, 13-15, P.G. 71, 592, 580.

of the Church, in the sense both of time and of space, in other words, all over the world and for ever.¹ This extension is to be understood both as her mission and her desire to be universal, and as the reality of this desire. The universality and the eternal power of the Church, depend on the fact that Christ, the eternal Logos, is her Head and foundation. 'Ακλόνητος παντελῶς ἡ Ἐκκλησία Χριστὸν ἔχουσα τὸν Θεμέλιον"²

However we have to remember that this Catholicity of the Church is not to be understood mainly in terms of time and space. It is not a quantitative or a geographical conception. The Universality of the Church is the manifestation but not the foundation of her catholicity. The Church was Catholic even when Christian Communities were very small.³ The Catholicity of the Church means, objectively the Unity of the Spirit and subjectively the unity of life.⁴

Finally, the Church is Apostolic because she has preserved the doctrines of the Apostles without any adulteration. "The light of Christ remains" Ἀσβεστον in the Church".⁵ So in the Church we can see the apostolic character in teaching which makes the Church the mouthpiece of the Apostles through the centuries.

As Apostolic the Church was sealed by the Spirit in the Twelve Apostles and the Apostolic Succession is a living and mysterious thread binding the whole historical fulness of Church life into One Catholic Whole.⁶

This apostolic character with all the others makes the Church the

1. In Zach. 2, 1-5. P.G. 72, 33.

2. In Isaian 70, 968.

3. Florovsky G. Sobornost: The Catholicity of the Church in the Church of God, ed. by E.L. Mascall. London 1934. p.56.

4. Florovsky G. op.c. p.59.

5. De Adorat. 9, P.G. 68, 641. "Ἀσβεστος ὁ παρὰ Χριστοῦ φωτισμός ταῖς Ἐκκλησίαις"

6. Florovsky G. op.c. p.62.

infallible guardian and teacher of Truth. "The Light of Christ remains truly pure and correct in the Church¹ in which there is no darkness of deceit since Christ lightens Her".²

All the local Churches are united through the one truth.

When Cyril says that the Church offers the truth infallibly, he does not mean that the Church offers new truths which were not revealed by the Lord, but he means that the Church develops, formulates and offers infallibly the truth which has been already revealed by Jesus Christ. This infallibility of the Church must not be identified with Inspiration of the authors of the Holy Scriptures.

In the case of the infallibility of the Church it has to be remembered that Christ is in the Church,³ He is the truth, so the truth is found in the Church which as a whole, clergymen and laymen, can teach the truth infallibly.

In order to show the significance and the place of the Church in the work of man's salvation, Cyril uses many adjectives and so characterises her as Inn⁴ which accepts and helps every one, or as true Tent⁵ or Holy Land⁶ or Holy Mother⁷ or Jerusalem⁸ or City of Peace⁹ for her members, or spiritual and true Sion.¹⁰ She is built on the Rock, on Christ, who has founded her from of old.¹¹ He is her King and Leader.¹² With all

-
1. De Adorat. 10. 10. P.G. 68, 677. "ἀεὶ καθαρὸν καὶ γνήσιον ἐν Ἐκκλησίαις τὸ Φῶς"
 2. De Adorat. 10. P.G. 68, 693. "σκότος ὅλως κοσμικῆς ἀπάτης οὐκ ἔστιν"
 3. De Adorat. 10. P.G. 68-693. "Χριστοῦ περιαστράπτοντος αὐτάς"
 4. In Luke 5, 30. P.G. 72, 681. "Πανδοχεῖον"
 5. De Adorat. 5. P.G. 68, 392. "Ἀληθεστάτη σκηνή"
 6. Glaph in Exod. 1. P.G. 69, 416. "Ἁγία Ἰῆ"
 7. Glaph in Genes. 6. P.G. 69, 324. "Ἱερὰ Μήτηρ"
 8. In Zach. 12, 8. P.G. 72, 217.
 9. In Is. 31, 15. P.G. 70, 716.
 10. In Is. 33, 56. P.G. 70, 72.
 11. Glaph. in Genes 1, 1. P.G. 69, 29.
 12. In Is. 42, 1. P.G. 70, 849.

these epithets Cyril shows the importance and the necessity of the Church for the work of man's Salvation. Cyril finds such inner relations between Christ and the Church that he calls her the Bride of Christ.¹ No doubt the saving acts of God in Jesus Christ brought the Church into being.²

The Christian Church cannot at all be identified with any other non-Christian community, like the ancient heathen one which was a desert³, nor with the Church of Israel before the Incarnation of the Logos. The Israelitic one was only a type of the Christian; it was imperfect and it became perfect only in Christ.⁴ Christ's Church is perfect, she is also full of spiritual "fruits"; in other words, she is able to illuminate and sanctify her members through the power of Jesus Christ, and to accept all people freely⁵ and to offer them divine Grace and their Salvation which came from Christ and of which the Church is the *Οἶκονόμος*. And this offer of Grace and Salvation to those who accept it, is the basic work and purpose of the Church.

To those who live in this Stone, i.e. in the Church, Bread and Water will be given. In other words, to them Christ as Bread of Life is given and the water of the Holy Baptism".⁶

Cyril speaks of the Church as the Ark of Grace and Salvation. Among Fathers the Church as the Body of Christ was looked on as the depository of pneumatic grace, which might be dispensed in sacramentalist fashion....

-
1. Glaph. in Genes. 1, 1. P.G. 69, 29.
 2. Torrance T.F. Conflict and Agreement in the Church. Vol. I'. London 1959 p. 202.
 3. In Is. 35, 1. P.G. 70, 749." 'Εκκλησία "Ερημος ".
 4. In Zach. 4, 8. P.G. 72, 69.
 5. In Is. 60, 11. P.G. 70, 1336.
 6. In Is. 33, 15. P.G. 70, 729." Τῷ κατοικίσαντι ἐν τῇ τοιαύτῃ Πέτρᾳ (τῇ 'Εκκλησίᾳ) δοθῆσεται μὲν ἄρτος, χορηγήσεται δὲ καὶ ὕδωρ πιστόν. Τοῖς οἰκοῦσι τὴν 'Εκκλησίαν ἄρτος, ζωῆς δίδεται. Χριστός καὶ μὴν καὶ ὕδωρ Πιστόν τοῦ Ἁγίου Βαπτίσματος ".

The Church, in other words possessed the means of Grace.¹ There is no doubt that Grace in the New Testament is the basic and the most characteristic element of the Christian Gospel.² That is why speaking of the Sacrament of Baptism within the Church, Cyril asserts that the man comes out of the baptismal font as holy in his body and his soul,³ and free of his previous sins,⁴ and thus he becomes participant of the Divine Nature.⁵ Then Cyril speaks about worship in the Christian Church. This worship is distinguished from any other non-Christian cult, because it is a worship in Christ.⁶

Here it has to be remembered that the Church and her priests offer Grace, not in their name, but in the name of the Saviour, Jesus Christ.⁷ Now, I am trying to present, shortly, Cyril's ideas and teaching about the Church, as the Mystical Body of Christ.⁸ Cyril has brought this doctrine to the highest perfection as far as the eastern tradition is concerned.⁹ In his teaching we can find all the elements which are found in the Fathers before him. And Cyril presents all these elements in an excellent synthesis.

In Cyril's teaching the hypostatic unity in Christ is the basis for the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ. The Logos has not only taken flesh but has become flesh. And because the Logos is Life, His humanity becomes life, as well, because of the unity. Human nature, i.e. all men generally are contained in Christ and vivified in Him. This unity between human

1. Torrance, T.F. *The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers*. London, 1948, p.141.

2. Torrance, T.F. *op.c.* p.34.

3. In Ioan. P.G. 73, 244-5)

4. In Luke. P.G. 72, 904.

5. In Luke. P.G. 72, 904.

6. I Ad. Cor. 3, 4 - 6. P.G. 74, 926.

7. In Ioan. 3, 34. P.G. 74, 280.

8. I. Cor. 12, 9. P.G. 74, 888.

9. Mersch. E. *Les Corps Mystique du Christ*. E.T. by J.R. Kelly. London 1938. p.337-8.

nature, namely between us and the Logos, makes us to be incorporated in Him and creates the Mystical Body.¹ "The Flesh (of our Lord) can give life, despite the fact that of itself the flesh profiteth nothing. Once it is united to the life-giving Logos, it is become whole life-giving, since it is raised to the power of the Logos. The Flesh does not bring the Logos down to its own level; for the divinity can in no wise be diminished. On itself the flesh is incapable of imparting life; it can do so only because it has within itself the life-giving Logos and because it exercises all the power of the Logos."²

Because of this hypostatic unity, the human nature of Christ was elevated in the highest degree, as we have seen in another chapter.

What Christ in His humanity produced by a visible activity during His life on earth is now produced in the Holy Eucharist. The doctrine of the Eucharist is connected with the doctrine of the Mystical Body,³ and is always examined under the light of the christological doctrine. Sometimes it is used as a dogmatical argument, against Nestorius' teaching.⁴ Cyril goes on to say. "A little leaven leaveneth all the dough. In like-manner a tiny "Eulogia" leaves our whole body and fills it with its own power. Thus Christ passes into us and we in turn pass in Him. May we not truly say that the leaven is in the whole Mass?"⁵ Again Cyril says: "We eat the proper flesh of the Logos, which, because it is the flesh of Him Who lives by the Father is becomes life-giving. Just as that body is life-giving which the Logos made His own by an unconceivable and ineffable union,

1. In Ioan. 4. P.G. 73, 601.

2. In Ioan. 4, 2. P.G. 73, 601.

3. In Ioan. 4, 2. P.G. 73, 577.

4. Theodorou Andreas. "The teaching of the Greek Fathers about Man's Deification". Athens 1956. p.142.

5. In Ioan. 4, 2. P.G. 73, 584.

so we who partake of His sacred flesh and blood are whole vivified. For the Logos abides in us, both divinely by the Holy Spirit and humanly by His sacred flesh and His precious blood.¹ I have already examined the doctrine of the Eucharist. What happened in the Incarnation happens in Communion. As the Logos elevated the human flesh, so in the Communion Christ, entering within us, sanctifies us, and transforms, and vivifies us.

In the Holy Eucharist man comes into his real life, and to contact with a higher and spiritual world.² However, although we must communicate again and again in the real presence of Christ - even through the Sacrament of Holy Communion, we cannot forget the reality of Baptism..... through Baptism the Church is once and for all incorporated into the Body of Christ.³ Undoubtedly without the hypostatic unity the Eucharist would be impossible.⁴

The unity of the Mystical Body depends on the unity of Christ. The mystery that took place in Christ was the beginning and the means of our participation in the Spirit and of our union with God.⁵

Again, speaking of the relations between the Eucharist and the Incarnation and their place in the doctrine of the Mystical Body, Cyril says: In His wisdom.... the Only-begotten Son has found a means of bringing us into unity with God and with one another, although because of our souls and bodies, we are each distinct personalities. Through one body, which is His one Body, He blesses, by a mysterious Communion, those who believe in Him and he makes them concorporal with Himself and with one another..... They have been united with Christ by means of His Own Holy Body. For we all eat of the one bread we all become one body since there can be no

1. Ad. Nestor. 4. P.G. 76, 193.

2. Bulgakov. 5. The Orthodox Church. London 1935, p.169.

3. Torrance T.F. Conflict and Agreement in the Church, London 1960, Vol.II'. p.173.

4. Adv. Nestor. 4. P.G. 76, 193.

5. In Ioan. P.G. 74, 561.

division in Christ. For this reason is the Church called the Body of Christ and we His members.¹

This unity of the believers with each other and of all of them with Christ, is a real and true union. Since we all receive within us the one spirit, who is the Holy Ghost, we are mingled both with one another and with God. For, although we are distinct, one from the other, and the Spirit of the Father and of the Son dwells in each one individually, yet this spirit is one and indivisible. Therefore He joins our many distinct spirits into unity and makes them one in Himself. Just as the power of the Holy Flesh makes concorporal those who, receive it, so the one indivisible Spirit who dwells in all, brings all into a spiritual unity²

Cyril often says that through the Eucharist Christ unites us among ourselves and all of us with God.³ "Christ comes into us corporally as man, mingling and uniting Himself with us through the mystery of the "Eulogia".⁴ Then we are transformed to what we receive and we bear Christ with Whom we are die, we are buried and we are risen. This happens because it is not we who change Christ to our nature but it is Christ who changes us and transforms us to His nature.⁵

This doctrine of the union of man with Christ is understood if we remember the ideas that Christ is the second Adam, the new beginning of mankind and that He is life, and so He can impart life to all members of His Body.⁶

Because of the hypostatic union, Christ contains our whole nature,⁷ all

1. In Ioan. P.G. 74, 561.

2. In Ioan. P.G. 74, 561.

3. In Ioan. 11, 12. P.G. 74, 564.

4. In Ioan. 11, 12. P.G. 75, 564.

5. Pourrat. P. La Spiritualite Chretienne. I, Des Origines de l' Eglise au Moyen. Paris 1947. p.372.

6. Ioan. 5, 2. P.G. 73, 753.

7. Mersch. E. op.c. p.350.

men, and especially all those who are regenerated in Him. It is by His Incarnation that Christ takes us in Himself, in His body. For it was necessary that human nature should be raised to the highest perfection.¹ For this perfection of our nature it is necessary that we should also be partakers of the Holy Spirit who elevates us to the Son and makes us partakers of the Divine nature.²

And it is in this Body that man can receive the gifts of the Cross, the gifts that Christ offers in His Church to all individuals.

-
1. In Ioan. 10, 2. P.G. 74, 432.
 2. In Ioan. 11, 10. P.G. 74, 545.

Third Section

The Completion of Salvation:

Eschatology

In Patristic Theology Soteriology is inseparably connected with Eschatology¹ because the state of Salvation of man is not limited to this life only. On the contrary. The work of man's Salvation will be perfect and permanent in the world of Eternity. "The Second Coming is in several aspects the completion of what Christ had already initiated in the First Coming. The judgement of the world is completed in this Second coming and God's time of waiting comes to an end."² Man's glorious state will be in its completion in the world of eternity, since the saved ones will be participating in the eternal glory of God. They will be for ever with Him, whom they will then know perfectly. This Union between man and God will not be a pantheistic shedding of the human nature into the Divine but a metaphysical reality.³ Eternal life, then, can be characterised as the state of man's glory, perfect happiness, and perfect knowledge. Here I am dealing with Cyril's teaching about the completion of man's Salvation in the eternal life. The possibility of such a discussion lies in the fact that "Christ is the Beginning and the End of all things".⁴ Even in Heaven, Christ, as God will be for ever the source of the glory and blessedness of those who will belong to Him and will be with Him eternally.

The eternal life, and therefore the completion of soteriology, is

-
1. Lampe G.W.H. Early Patristic Eschatology in Eschatology: Scottish Journal of Theology ed. by T.F. Torrance, oc. p. 2.
 2. McIntyre J. The Christian doctrine of History. London 1957. p.83.
 3. Theodorou Andreas. op.c. p.176.
 4. Glaph in Exod. 13. 1, 3. P.G. 69, 512.

inseparably related to the Second Coming of Christ, the great Day of Christ,¹ the Day of Universal Award.²

Cyril believes that when the time of this world passes away, and its end comes,³ the divine judge will come, and will be accompanied with all His Angels in the glory of His Father.⁴ Cyril is certain about Christ's coming and the Judgement so that he says "men are here on earth Μέτοικοι καὶ Παρεπίδημοι."⁵ Cyril has also no doubt at all that Christ's Judgement will be most righteous,⁶ because He is Righteous Judge.⁷ Christ is Judge in both Comings as He is Saviour. What we should be added, however, is that the Second Coming is not a Revelation in the sense that we have come to to describe the First.... He does not come then to reveal hidden mysteries of the Godhead but to execute before our eyes and in no symbol that which we already know will be.⁸

The Resurrection of man is based and depends on Christ. Christ, risen first from the Dead, is the cause of man's resurrection. All those who have followed Him in His Death, will follow Him in His Resurrection as well.⁹ The bodily Resurrection will be universal.¹⁰ But not all people

-
1. In Osie 1, 11. p.G. 71, 57.
 2. In Luk. 9-18. P.G. 72, 541.
 3. In Isaian 60, 19. P.G. 70, 1349. "κατά τὴν προσδοκωμένην...Συντέλειαν"
 4. C. Anthropol. 25. P.G. 76, 1128. "...καταφοιτήσαντος τοῦ Σωτῆρος Χριστοῦ"
 5. In Ioan. 15, 14. P.G. 74, 385.
 6. In Zachar. 1, 5-6. P.G. 72, 17. "Δικαιοσύνη Κρίσις"
 7. In Isaian 22, 5. P.G. 70, 508. "Δίκαιος Κριτής"
 8. McIntyre J. The Christian Doctrine of History. p.83.
 9. In I Ep. ad Corinth. 15, 12. P.G. 74, 896.
 10. In I ad Cor. 15, 51. P.G. 74, 913. "ἀναβιώσονται ὁμολογουμένως τὰ πάντων σώματα"

will take part in the "Eternal Festival" of Heaven, because not all people belong to Christ as their God and Head. Cyril has no doubt that only those who belong to Christ here on earth and who are holy will be with God and will be participants of Paradise".¹ That is why Christ after His death went to the Hades "in order to redeem those who were going to believe. They realized Him who came to them and enjoyed His Epiphany".²

According to the biblical teaching of Cyril, nature will change completely and then a New Heaven and a New Earth are expected to appear.³ The 'New Earth' will be incomparably much better than the present.⁴ Therefore the destruction of the present world will take place in order that the New Heavens and the New Earth may be made.⁵

The 'world' will have another absolutely different face: it will be spiritual..... We expect New Heavens and a New Earth⁶. Under the New Heavens and Earth we should not mean only our Solar System but the whole Universe.⁷

Cyril follows St. Paul in saying that even creation will become free from corruption.⁸

Because of this strong hope of eternal life, Cyril, following the biblical teaching, believes that this present life on earth is not the

1. In Psalm. 48, 16. P.G. 69, 1072.

2. Ad Hebr. P.G. 74, 1013.

3. In Rom. 8, 19. P.G. 74, 821.

4. Ibid. 8, 19. P.G. 74, 821.

5. Trembelas P. Dogmatics, etc. III' 511-12.

6. In Is. 24, 4. P.G. 70, 537. "Ὁὐρανὸς καινὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ καινὴ"

7. Trembelas op.c. p.512.

8. In Is. 24, 4. P.G. 70, 537. "Ἡ κτίσις ἐλευθερωθήσεται"

real life and true home of Christians, who live here as "strangers".¹

It is for this reason that we expect to change our dwelling-place from Earth to Heaven, from this life, bound by human time, to the heavenly life free of human time, from the life of corruption, to the life of incorruption, and from the life of weakness to the life of power.

"As our nature, received by God, through its unity with Divinity, was risen, and putting away the corruption with all passions, became incorruptible, in the same way you will be freed from the slavery of death and putting away the corruption with all passions will put on passionlessness."²

Cyril goes on further to say that then neither Baptism nor the Holy Eucharist will be necessary³ since there will be no possibility of sin, and because believers will enter into a state of eternal glory. And it is the whole man who will be glorified in his soul and in his body.

The unity of man with God will be perfect in the eternal life; then man will see the perfect glory of Christ and will have a perfect knowledge of God. I think I should let Cyril express this part in his own words.

"When, that time would be, He did not tell them very clearly. It may be in the time to come, after the end of the world, when we shall behold, unveiled and open to our gaze, the glory of God, who will Himself impart to us knowledge concerning Himself, in perfect clearness.... We see in a mirror and we know in part but when that which is perfect comes, that which is in part shall go away As, in the darkness of the night, the bright

1. De Adorat. 1, 11. P.G. 68, 761. "παροιχίαν μάλλον οἶεσθαι δεῖν τὴν σῶματι ζῶην"

2. De Domini Incarnat. () 28. P.G. 75, 1468.
The genuity of this work has been denied.

3. Ibid.

beauty of the stars shines forth ... but when the sun arises with its radiant beams, then that light which is but part, goes away, and the lustre of the stars waxes feeble and ineffective, in like manner, I think, the knowledge that we have now will cease, and that which is 'in part' will vanish away at the moment of time when the perfect light comes upon us and sheds forth its radiance, filling us with the perfect knowledge of God. Then, when we are enabled to approach God, in confidence, Christ will tell us the things which concern His Father. For now, by shadows and illustrations and various images and types, deduced from different phases of human life, we feebly trace our steps to a vague, uncertain knowledge, through the inherent weakness of our minds. Then, however, we shall stand in no need of any type or riddle or parable, but shall behold, after a fashion, fact to face, and with unshackled mind, the fair vision of the Divine Nature of God the Father, having seen the glory of the One who proceeded from Him. Now we know Him in the perfection of the glory that belongs to His Divine Nature because of our humanity. But when the season of His Incarnation is past and the mystery of our redemption completely wrought out, henceforth He will be seen in His own glory and in the glory of God the Father.¹

In this passage we can see how Cyril connects Soteriology with the state of man in the eternal life. The teaching of transformation and passionlessness and Incorruptibility and Immortality of man is common among the Fathers.² Perfect knowledge of God, perfect blessedness, by being ever with God, and perfect glory, by being ever with God, with constitute this

1. In Ioan. 16, 25. P.G. 74, 461-464.

2. Karmiris J. Synopsis etc. p.110.

perfect and glorious state. Man's soul and spirit will be perfectly illuminated and filled by the Divine and unspeakable light¹ and a real Divine Wisdom will be for ever within them.²

This spiritual aspect of man's eternal unity with God's will characterises his state in heaven. But Cyril does not speak only of this spiritual aspect of eternal life. He also speaks about the position of the saved people in heaven as far as their bodies are concerned. So Cyril says that man will rise from the Dead in their bodies, which will change completely and will no longer remain fleshy but will become Spiritual, free from corruption, death, and sin.³ Here, as we see, man's Salvation or man's state of eternal glory, is connected with the glorious condition of man's body. From a state of weakness and corruption, it will change into a state of divine glory.⁴ Human Nature will be wearing Incorruptibility.⁵ Men will become incorrupted.⁶ This body will be strong⁷, therefore free from any natural infirmity, weakness and lack, free also from any moral lack, since it will be sinless, by Grace, and will be interested only in spiritual matters⁸ without the danger of turning to evil. That is why even the body will be full of glory⁹ which will also be eternal.¹⁰

Speaking of eternal life and glory, Cyril refers to the whole man, his

-
1. In Propet. Malach. 4, 2. P.G. 72, 360.
 2. Glaph. in Exod. 1, 2. P.G. 69-429
 3. In Matth. 25, 31. P.G. 72, 449. "Αποδύεται τήν φοβράν τό ἐκ γῆς...ἐνδύεται τήν ἀφθαρσίαν".
 4. In Ep. 11 ad Corinth. 3, 18. P.G. 74, 932.
 5. In Matth. (frag) 1, 9. P.G. 72, 474
 6. In Ep. 1 ad Cor. 15-51. P.G. 74-913 "Αφθαρτοι καί Ἀνώλεθροι".
 7. In Luk. 20, 27. P.G. 74, 905. "Εὐσθενές".
 8. In Luk. 20, 27. P.G. 72, 892. "...βλέπον εἰς μόνα τά τοῦ Πνεύματος".
 9. Hom. Pasch, 10. P.G. 77, 625.
 10. In Is. 28, 5-6. P.G. 70, 617. "Ἀτελεβήτητος".

soul and his body. The whole man will be participating in the glorious life which is nothing else but being together with Christ for ever¹ being in Christ and having Christ in Himself. In Christian eschatology the notion of eschaton is concerned with the end of history,² i.e. with the end of the history as it is known here on earth, with the end of our human earthly history.

For Cyril, eternal life means to be with Christ eternally, in Heaven.³ In this eternal life, man will be free from corruption, from death and from sin.⁴

This life will be both an endless life⁵ and a life of real enjoyment.⁶

This Enjoyment and blessedness of the saved will be both endless⁷ and ineffable as well. It will be a spiritual way of blessedness and joy.⁸ That is why Cyril says that all painful efforts for virtuous living are of much smaller value in comparison with the glory and blessedness of eternal life.⁹

The saved people will never see death, spiritual or bodily, because Christ, by His death, has destroyed the power of death.¹⁰

Speaking of eternity, Cyril does not forget to mention the state of those who will not belong to Christ. They will rise from the dead, too.¹¹

1. In Ioan. 17, 24. P.G. 74, 568.

2. McIntyre J. The Shape of Christology. London 1966. p.80.

3. In Js. 24, 14. P.G. 70, 545.

4. In Is. 6, 12. P.G. 70, 189.

5. In Ioan. 4, 37. P.G. 73, 328. "Ζωή Αἰώνιος"

6. De Adorat. 1, 17. P.G. 68, 1109. "Τρυφή"

7. De Adorat. 12. P.G. 68, 842.

8. In Ioan. 14, 21. P.G. 74, 284. "Τρυφῆς τρόπος Πνευματικός"

9. In Rom. 8, 17. P.G. 74, 821.

10. In Ioan. 8, 51. P.G. 73, 916.

11. In Sophon. 3, 18. P.G. 71, 1017.

Cyril says that the Judgement of all people will take place after the resurrection of the dead¹. Those who do not believe to Christ and do not accept Him as God and Saviour, because of their sins, they will be punished, and their punishment will be endless, eternal.² Cyril characterizes the state of that punishment as really eternal sorrow³ and as a really horrible punishment⁴ without end.⁵ This teaching has been in agreement with the Holy Scripture and the Patristic Tradition.⁶

Cyril calls Hades the Prison of the Souls.⁷

However, God's Judgement, even for those who will be condemned will be righteous⁸. Cyril does not accept the ideas of universalism 'Αποκατάστασις of Origen since he admits and teaches the eternal punishment of the sinful. God's Love cannot destroy his righteousness nor would the righteous people, here on earth, be ready to live according to God's will, since their lives would be considered equally like the life of the wrong-doing ones.

So then, in the new state of eternity, Christ will Recapitulate all. He will be the link between the blessed ones and God the Father. Because of His humanity which He took from us, He is and will be for ever the Head of the redeemed ones of the heavenly Church, whose offering of glory and love to the Holy Trinity will be both pure and eternal.⁹

1. In Luke. 16, 19. P.G. 72, 821-4.

2. De Ador. 1, 13. P.G. 68, 877.

3. Hom. Div. 14. P.G. 77, 1080. "...τὴν τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν ἀτελεύτητον κόλασιν"

4. Hom. Div. 14. P.G. 77, 1076.

5. Hom. Div. 14. P.G. 77, 1072. "...τὴν οὐκ ἔχουσιν τέλος"

6. Trembelas Dogmatics III 502.

7. In Isaian. P.G. 70, 153. "Δεσμωτήριον ἀθλῶν ψυχῶν"

8. In Js. 16, 6. P.G. 70, 412.

9. De Adorat. 1, 13. P.G. 68, 877. "...λειτουργήσμενον καθαρώτερον"

Bishops and Patriarchs of Alexandria until Cyril.¹

Mark, the Evangelist	A.D.	-62	+ 63
Anianus	"	62-84	61-82
Abilius	"	84-98	83-95
Kerdon	"	98-110	96-106
Primus	"	110-121	106-118
Iustos	"	121-131	118-129
Eumenes	"	131-144	129-141
Mark B'	"	144-154	142-152
Keladion	"	164-167	152-166
Agrippinus	"	167-179	166-178
Iulianus	"	179-189	178-189
Demetrius	"	189-232	189-232
Iraclas	"	232-247	232-248
Dionysius	"	248-265	248-264
Maximus	"	265-282	265-282
Theonas	"	282-300	282-300
Peter A'	"	300-311	300-311
Achillas	"	311-312	312-313
Alexander A'	"	313-328	313-328
Athanasius	"	328-373	328-373
Peter B'	"	373-380	373-381
Timothy A'	"	380-385	381-385
Theophilus	"	385-412	385-412
Cyril	"	412-444	412-444

1. Stephanides B. Ecclesiastical History, Athens 1948, p.740.
 Papadopoulos Chrysostom. History of the Church of Alexandria
 Alexandria 1935, p.909-910.
 " " Tables of Patriarchs of Alexandria,
 in Periodical "Pantaenos" Alexandria 1926, p.17-19.

Alexandria was the second City of the Roman Empire. That is why its Bishop was Second after the Bishop of Rome and therefore the first in the East (since the 3rd Century) To this political reason later on other ecclesiastical reasons were added, i.e. the victory of Alexandria against Arianism in the First Ecumenical Synod.¹ The 3 Canon of the Second Ecumenical Synod (381) recognized Constantinople as the second See after Rome. This Canon was against Alexandria. And the 28th Canon of the Fourth Ecumenical Synod (451) acknowledged Constantinople as equal to Rome. Cyril was the last great Patriarch of Alexandria.

1. Harnack Ad. op. c. II. 236. note 3.

Chronological Table
of Cyril's Works

A.D. 412 - 429. Exegesis and Polemics against Arianism.

" 429 - 444. Polemics against Nestorianism.

A' Exegesis - Commentaries

- | | | |
|-----------|--|------------------------------|
| I | De Adoratio et cultu in Spiritu | ; after 412 - before 429 |
| (In O.T.) | Glaphyra | ; of the same time |
| | Commentarius in Isaiam | ; after Glaphyra, before 429 |
| | Commentarius in duodecim prophetas | ; |
| II | Commentarius in Ioannem | ; 425-428 |
| (In N.T.) | Commentarius in Lucam | ; 430 |
| | Commentarius in Matthaeum | ; after 428 |
| | (Cyril has written some more commentaries) | |

B' Dogmatic-Polemical writings against Arianism

- | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Thesaurus | ; after 412 |
| De Sancta et Consust. Trinitate | ; after the previous book |

C' Dogmatic-Polemical writings against Nestorianism

- | | |
|---|--------------------------|
| Adversus Nestorii blasphemias | ; 430 (spring) |
| De Recta in Dominum nostrum | ; |
| Jesum Christum fide ad Imperatorem | ; 430 |
| Duodecim Anathematismi adv. Nestorium | ; 430-431 |
| Apologia c. Orientales Episcopos | ; 431 |
| Epistola ad Eupotimum | ; 431 |
| Explicatio duodecim capitum Ephesi | ; 431 (he was in prison) |
| Apologia adv. Imperatorem (De Recta Fide) | ; 431 (after October) |
| Scholia de Incarnatione Unigeniti | ; after 431 |
| Adversus Nolentes confiteri sanctam | |
| Virginem esse Deiparum | ; (after 431) |
| Contra Diodarum Tarsi, et Theodorum | |
| Mopsuestias | ; 438 |

Quod unus sit Christus. (his last Antinostorian work)

Apologeticus adv. libros Iuliani 433-441

Homiliae diversae : (The first eight (8) in Summer 431 during the

(N.4 the best ancient Marian Sermon) Council of Ephesus

Epistolae (some spurious). Epist. n. 4 addressed to Nestorius and called

Dogmatica Epistola was approved by the Council of Ephesus.

Ep. n. 3 became the Symbolum Ephesium, approved by Synod of Chalcedon.

Homiliae Paschales (411-442). It was in One of those in 429 that Cyril

repudiated Nestorius' teaching for first time.

Important Dates of Cyril's Life

- 375-8 Probable Birth of Cyril.
- 403 Cyril participated in the Synod of the Oak (near Chalcedon)
- 412, (Oct. 17) Cyril Patriarch of Alexandria.
- 417 Cyril replaced Chrysostom's name in the Diptychs of his Church.
- 428 Nestorius became Bishop of Constantinople. He was pupil of Theodor of Mopsuestia in Antioch and had accepted his teaching. He denied the Unity of the Person of Jesus Christ. This Controversy probably existed in Antioch. Syngellos Anastasius took part for this teaching. Eusebius, later bishop of Dorylaeon, accused Nestorius openly and appealed to Cyril of Alexandria and to Celestine of Rome.
- 429 Cyril replied to Nestorius' teaching and repudiated it in his Paschal Letter and in his Encyclical Letter to the Monks of Egypt. For the second time the two patriarchal Sees of Constantinople and Alexandria came to collision. (First at the time of Theophilus and Chrysostom).
- 430 Correspondence between Cyril and Nestorius. Cyril and Nestorius appealed to Pope Celestine. Synod in Rome declared Nestorius as a heretic. The Pope entrusted Cyril to communicate the decision to Nestorius. Cyril wrote a long dogmatical letter, including 12 Anathemas, against Nestorius' teaching and added them to Pope's letter. Synod at Alexandria approved Cyril's profession of faith.

Nestorius did not accept Cyril's teaching. He replied with 12, Counter-Anathemas.

(480-450)

Emperor Theodosius II' (in Constantinople) liked Nestorius' ideas.

431

Synod at Ephesus (Third Ecumenical) Cyril came to Ephesus with Bishops, Monks and others. He presided the Synod. 160 Bishops participated in the Synod but its decisions were accepted and signed later by 200 bishops. Nestorius was invited to the Synod 3 times but he refused to go.

431 (July 10,11)

The three representatives of the Pope of Rome came later but accepted the decisions of the Synod.

431 (June 22)

The Synod condemned Nestorius and his teaching, confirmed the Confession of Cyril about the Two Natures of Jesus Christ and their Union, and recognized the title Theotokos for Virgin Mary.

431 (June 26)

John of Antioch and his bishops came to Ephesus, took part with Nestorius and held a Synod with friends of Nestorius. The representative of the Emperor Kandidianos cooperated with them. They excommunicated Cyril and Memnon, bishop of Ephesus. Cyril and Nestorius were sent to jail by the Emperor. A great demonstration of Monks took place in front of the Emperor's Palace.

431 (Oct.30)

Cyril returned to Alexandria and was welcomed with a great honour while Nestorius retired in a monastery in Antioch. The Emperor decided to realize a reconciliation between the

433

two parts. A meeting of Cyril and Nestorius with the Emperor failed. Aristolaos, one of the officians of the State, was sent to Syria and Egypt. A reconciliation was realized on the basis of a Confession of Faith, written by Theodoret of Cyrus (431) and which now was enriched with the teaching of Communicatio Idiomatum.

Cyril accepted the teaching of Two Natures "after the Union" and John of Antioch accepted the teaching about the Communicatio Idiomatum. The title "Theotokos" was acknowledged. The Antiochene Theologians accepted the Condemnation of Nestorius and his teaching. This Confession became the official dogmatical definition of the Third Ecumenical Synod.

433 (Spring)

Cyril sent a letter to John and expressed his great joy for the peace between them, and summed up the right christological doctrine of the Church. This letter was recommended by the Fourth Ecumenical Synod of Chalcedon (451). Cyril wrote to Pope Sixtus III that peace was restored and continued his christological work.

438-440

Cyril condemned Theodore of Mopsuestia and Diodore of Tarsus. However, they died within the Church and Cyril became more conservative in order to avoid a new controversy in the Church. But he continued his dogmatical polemics against Theodoret of Cyrus who had not condemned Nestorius. Cyril died.

444 (June 27)

BibliographyI. SourcesThe Works of Cyril - Editions. Collections. Translations.

Migne, J.P. Patrologia Graeca, Vols. 68-77, Paris, 1863-64 (= P.G.)

Commentaries on Old Testament

De Adoratione et cultu in spiritu et veritate	P.G. 68, 133-1125
Glaphyra	P.G. 69, 9-678
Fragmenta in Regem	69, 679-698
Explanatio in Psalmos (fragmenta)	69, 717-1273
Fragmenta in Proverbia et in Cantico Canticorum	69, 1277-1294
Commentarius in Isaiam Prophetam	P.G. 70, 9-1450
Fragmenta in Jeremian et Baruch	70, 1451-1458
Fragmenta in Ezeckiel et Daniel	70, 1458-1462
Commentarius in duodecim prophetas	P.G. 71, 72, 9-364

Commentaries on New Testament

Commentarius in Matthaeum (Fragmenta)	P.G. 72, 365-475
Commentarius in Lucam	72, 457-950
" in Ioannem	P.G. 73, 74, 9-756
" in Epistolam ad Romanos (Fragm.)	74, 773-856
" " " A' ad Corinthios (Fragm.)	74, 856-916
" " " V' " " "	74, 916-952
" " " ad Hebraeos	74, 953-1006

Dogmatic - Polemical writings against Arianism.

Thesaurus de Sancta et Consubstant. Trinitate.	P.G. 75, 9-656
De Sancta et Consubstant. Trinitate.	" 75, 657-1124.

Dogmatic - Polemical writings against Nestorianism

Quod unus sit Christus	P.G. 75, 1253-1361
Scholia de Incarnatione Unigeniti	75, 1369-1412
Adversus Nestorius blasphemias	76 9-248
Adversus Nolentes Confiteri sanctam virginem esse Deiparum	76, 255-292
Explicatio duodecim capitum	76, 293-312
Explicatio pro duodecim capitibus adversus Orientales Episcopos	76, 315-385
Epistola ad Euphrium adv. Impugnationem duodecim, capitum a Theodoro editam	76, 385-452
De Recta Fide ad Imperatorem	76, 453-488
Pro sancta christianorum religione adversus libros athei Julian	76, 503-1064
Epistola ad Calosyrium	76, 1066-1077
De Recta in Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum fide ad Imperatorem Theodosium. II'.	76, 1133-1200
De Recta Fide ad Dominas	76, 1201-1336
De Recta Fide ad Augustas	76, 1336-1420
Centra Diodorum et Theodorum	76, 1437-1452
Epistolae	P.G. 77, 9-390
Homiliae Paschales	77, 401-981

Homiliae diversae (some spurious)

77, 981-1116

The genuity of the following works has been denied.

De Sancta et Vivifica Trinitate)

1147-1190

De Incarnatione Domini)

P.G. 75,

1419-1478

Contra Anthropomorphitas

P.G. 76, 1-1132

PUSEY. P.E.

Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli archiepiscopi Alexandrini in d. Ioannis evangelium. Accedunt fragmenta varia necnon tractatus ad Tiberium diaconum duo. 3 vols. Oxford 1872

Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli archiepiscopi Alexandrini epistolae tres oecumenicae, Libri V contra Nestorium, XVI capitum explanatio, XII capitum defensio utraque, Scholia de Incarnatione Unigeniti. Oxford, 1875.

Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli archiepiscopi Alexandrini de Recta fide ad Imperatorem, De Incarnatione Unigeniti, Dialogus, De recta fide ad principissas, De Recta fide ad Augustas, Quod unus Christus dialogus, Apologeticus ad imperatorem. Oxford 1877.

Also, three works which are not contained in P.G.

De Dogmatum solutione (Pusey, In Ionnem³ etc. vol. 547-556. Responsiones ad Tiberium diaconum sociosque suos (ibid. 3, 567-602)

Contra Synonsiastas (fragments) ibid. 3, 476-491.

- Schwartz E. Acta Conciliorum oecumenicorum. Concilium Universale Ephesium 1. Acta Graeca partes 1-3. Berlin and Leipzig, 1927-30.
- Mansi. J.D. Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio. Florence, 1759-1798 (Reprint and Contini) Paris and Leipzig, 1901-1927.
- Payne - Smith. R.S. Cyrilli Alexandriae archiepiscopi commentarii in Lucae evangelium quae supersunt syriacae. Oxford, 1858. E.T. A Commentary upon the Gospel according to St. Luke by St. Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria. 2 vols. Oxford 1859.
- Ricker. A. Die Lukashomilien des hl. Cyrill von Alexandrien Breslau 1911, cf. p.p. 87-101 (unedited fragments in Syriac and German).
- Sickenberger. J. Fragmente der Homilien des Cyrill von Alexandrien zum Lukasevangelium. (in Texte und Untersuchungen 34/1, Leipzig 1909, 63-108)
- Chabot. I.B. S. Cyrilli Alexandrini commentarii in Lucam 1. (CSCO 70, Scriptores syri 27) Paris and Leipzig, 1912. Latin Translation: Tonneau, R.M. S. Cyrilli Alexandrini commentarii in Lucam 1 (CSCO 140, Scriptores syri 70). Louvain 1953.

(CSCO = Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, Louvain 1903, 77)

For the chapter "A brief history of the Soteriological doctrine of the Greek Fathers I have used the works of the Apostolic Fathers, of the Apologist Justin and the Epistle to Diognetus, of Irenaeus and Hippolytus, of the Alexandrian theologians, Clement of Alexandria, Origen of Methodius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory of Nazianzus, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, Eusebius of Caesarea, John Chrysostom, and St. Athanasius from Patrologia Graeca in Mign's edition.

II. Select Bibliography

A' books

- Adam, K. Der Christus des Glaubens. Tübingen 1954. (E.T. by J. Crick. N. York, 1957).
- Agourides Sabbas. The Teaching of St. Paul on Salvation. Thessaloniki, 1962
- Agourides Sabbas. The New Testament Doctrine of the Atonement according to the Orthodox Tradition. Athens 1964.
- Altaner, B. Patrologie.⁶ Freiburg. 1960.
- Androutsos Chr. Dogmatics of the Orthodox Catholic Church². Athens 1956.
- Aulen, G. Christus Victor. London 1931 (E.T. by A.G. Hebert)
- Balanos, D. Patrology. Athens 1930.
- Bardenhewer, O. Patrologie³. Freiburg 1910.
- Bardenhewer, O. Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur.² Freiburg 1912.
- Barth, K. Kirchliche Dogmatik I, 2 Zürich 1938, IV. 1 Zürich 1950, IV, 2. Zürich, 1955. I 2. E.T. by G.W. Bromiley. Edinburgh, 1963.
- IV 2. E.T. by G.W. Bromiley Edinburgh 1958.
- Baur, F. Die Christliche Lehre von der Versöhnung. Tübingen 1838.
- Bethune-Baker, G.F. Nestorius and his Teaching. Cambridge 1908.
- Bethune-Baker, G.F. An Introduction to the early history of the christian doctrine. London 1903.
- Bigg, C. The Christian Platonists of Alexandria² Oxford 1913.
- Bose, W. The Soteriology of New Testament, London 1907.
- Brunner, E.M. Der Mittler. Zürich 1947.
- Bulgakov, Sergius. The Orthodox Church. London 1935.
- Burghardt, W. The Image of God in Man according to St. Cyril of Alexandria. Washington 1957.

- Campbell, J. The Greek Fathers. London 1929.
- Campbell, J. The Doctrine of Atonement⁶ Cambridge 1869.
- Campanhausen, H. Griechische Kirchenväter. Stuttgart 1955.
- Cave, S. The Christian estimate of Man³ London 1957.
- Congar, Y. Jesus Christ. Paris 1965 (E.T. by L. O'Neil, London 1966)
- Dale, R. The Atonement¹⁸ London 1896.
- Denney, J. The Death of Christ. London 1902.
- Diepen, H.M. Aux origines de l'Anthropologie de St.Cyrille d'Alexandrie. Paris. 1957.
- Dörholt, B. Die Lehre von der Genugthuung Christi. Paderborn 1891.
- Dorner, I.A. Entwicklungsgeschichte der Lehre von der Person Christi in der ersten vier Jahrhunderten 'I'.II') Berlin 1851.
- Dratsellas, C. The Theotokos and the Akathistos Hymn. Athens. 1957.
- Dries, J. The Formula of St.Cyril of Alex. "Mia Physis ton Theon Logou sesarcmeni". London 1936.
- Dubarle, A. Les conditions du salut, avant le venue de Saviour chez St.Cyrille d'Alex. (in Rev. des Sciences Philos et Theol. Paris. 1948. (32.359-362.)
- Eberlie, A. Die Mariologie des Cyrilles von Alex.
- Florovsky, G.
Sobornost: The Catholicity of the Church. (in The Church of God, ed. by Mascall, E.L.) London 1934.
- Florovsky, G. The Ethos of the Orthodox Church. (in Orthodoxy, ed. by
- Gehlen, A. Anthropologische Forschung. München. 1961.
- Guidici, G. La doctrina della Grazia nel Commento ai Romani di St.Cirillo d'Alexandria. Roma 1951.

- Grensted, L. The Atonement in History and Life. London 1936.
- Grillmeier, A. Die Theologische sprachliche Vorbereitung der Christologischen Formel von Chalkedon (in Das Konzil von Chalkedon, Herausg. v. Grillmeier. Würzburg 1951. (E.T. by J.S. Bowden, London 1965. Christ in Christian Tradition).
- Hagenbach, K.R. A History of Christian Doctrines. E.T. from the 5th German ed. by E.H. Plumptre vol. 1. Edinburgh 1830.
- Harnack, Ad. Dogmengeschichte.³ Berlin 1893 E.T. by E. Speirs. Vol. IV London 1899.
- Hearing, Theod. Der Christl. Glauben. E.T. by J. Dickies - G. Ferries. London 1915.
- Hefele, C.J. Conciliengeschichte. 9 Bde. Freiburg 1855/90', 1875.
- Heidegger, M. An Introduction to Metaphysics. (E.T. by R. Manheim) London 1959.
- Janssens, L. Notre filiation divine d'appres St.Cyrille d'Alex. (in Ephem. Theol. Lovanienses. Louvain 1935. (15. 233-278)
- Karmiris, J. Synopsis of Dogmatics of the Orth. Cath. Church. Athens 1960.
- Karmiris, J. Symbolical and Dogmatical Monuments of the Orthodox Cath. Church. Athens Vol.I. Vol.II.
- Karmiris, J. The Ecclesiology of Sts. Basil, Gregory the theologian and John Chrysostom. Athens 1962.
- Kelly, J. Early Christian Doctrines. London 1958.
- Lampe, G.W.H. Early Putristic Eschatology in Scottish Journal of Theology. ed. by T.F. Torrance, (oc. paper 2.)
- Liachtsenko Cyril the Archbishop of Alex. Kiev. 1913. (in Russian)
- Lidgett, S. The Spiritual principle of the Atonement. London 1897;
- Liebaert, J. La doctrine christologique de saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie avant la querelle nestorienne Lille 1951.
- Lietzmann, H. Apollinarius and seine Schule.
- Loofs, Fr. Nestoriana, Halle 1905.
- Loofs, Fr. Dogmengeschichte,⁴ Halle 1906.

- McIntyre, J. The Shape of Christology. London 1966.
- McIntyre, J. St. Anselm and his critics. Edinburgh 1954.
- McIntyre, J. On the Love of God. London 1962.
- McIntyre, J. The Christian Doctrine of History. Edinburgh 1957.
- McKintosh, H.R. The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ. Edinburgh 1912.
- Mahe, J. La sanctification d'après St. Cyrille d'Alex. (in Rev. Hist. Eccles. Louvain, 10, 1909).
- Manoir, de J. Dogme et Spiritualité chez Cyrille d'Alex.
- Manoir, de J. L'Eglise Corps du Christ chez Cyrille d'Alex.
- Mersch, E.M. Le Corps Mystique du Christ (E.T. by J.R. Kelly) London 1938.
- Mozley, J. The Doctrine of the Atonement. London 1915.
- Oxenham, H.N. The Catholic Doctrine of the Atonement². London 1869.
- Papadopoulos Chrysostom. St. Cyril of Alexandria. Alexandria 1933.
- Papadopoulos Chr. History of the Church of Alexandria. Alexandria 1935.
- Papadopoulos Chr. Tables of Patriarchs of Alexandria. In Periodical "Pantaenos" Alexandria (19) 1929.
- Pohle, J. Soteriologie (E.T. by A. Preuss St. Louis 1914).
- Pourrat, P. La Spiritualité Chrétienne I^{re} Des Origines de l'Eglise au Moyen. Paris 1947.
- Prat, F. The Theology of St. Paul, London 1957.
- Quasten, J. Patrology. Vols. I 1950, II 1953, III 1960. Utrecht.
- Rashdall, H. The Idea of Atonement. London 1925.
- Rehrmann, A. Die Christologie des hl. Cyrillus v. Alex. Hildesheim. 1902.
- Riviere, J. Le dogme de la Rédemption. E.T. by Cappadelta (Vol. I^{re} London 1909)

- Sabatier. La Doctrine de l'expiation et son evolution historique. Paris 1903.
- Scheeben, M. Handbuch der Kath. Dogmatik (Dk. 3, 4.) Freiburg 1961.
- Seeberg, R. Lehrbuch der Dogmen - geschichte³. Leipzig. vol. 2. 1923.
- Sellers, Two Ancient Christologies. London 1940.
- Sellers The Council of Chalcedon. London 1953.
- Schmaus M. Kathol. Dogmatik.⁵ I 1/2. München 1955.
- Schlink. Der Mensch in der Verkündigung der Kirch. München 1936.
- Stephanides, B. Ecclesiastical History. Athens, 1948.
- Strong, A.H. Systematic Theology. Vol.I. 1906. vol.II. 1907. Philadelphia.
- Struckmann, A. Die Eucharistielehre des hl. Cyrill von Alexandrien. Paderbom. 1910.
- Theodorou, Andreas. The Christological teaching and terminology of Cyril of Alex. and of Theodoret of Cyrus. Athens 1955.
- Theodorou, Andreas The Doctrine of the Greek Fathers about Man's deification. Athens 1956.
- Theodorou, Andreas. History of Dogmas. Vol.I' part 1. Athens 1963.
- Torrance, T.F. The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers, Edinburgh 1948.
- Torrance, T.F. Uppfattningen om försoningen i urkyrkan Kristi tmbete. (in Swedish) Lund 1959.
- Torrance, T.F. Theology in Reconstruction. London 1965.
- Torrance, T.F. Conflict and Agreement in the Church. London Vol.I'. 1959. vol.II'. 1960.
- Trembelas, P. Dogmatics of the orth. Cath. Church. Athens Vol.I' 1959. Vol.II' 1959. vol.III'. 1961.
- Trembelas, P. The New Testament with a brief Interpretation. Vol.I'. Athens 1953.
- Trench, The Synonyms of the New Testament.

- Turner, H.E.W. The Patristic doctrine of Redemption. London 1952.
- Weigl, E. Die Heilslehre d. Cyrill v. Alexandrian Mainz 1905.
- Wintersig Die Heilsbedeutung der Menschheit Jesu in der Vornizan.
Griech. Theologie, 1932.
- Zeukovsky, B. Das Bild vom menschen in der Ostkirche. Stuttgart 1951.

B¹ Dictionaries

1. A Patristic Greek Lexicon ed. by G.H. Lampe. Oxford 1961.
2. A Greek-English Lexicon ed. by H. Liddell and R. Scott (rev.ed.) Oxford 1940.
3. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament³. ed. by Grimm C. Edinburgh 1893.
4. Lexilogos ed. by Ph. Buttman. London 1846.
5. Religious and Ethical Encyclopaedia. ed. by Ath. Marinos. Athens 1962.
6. Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, ed. by J. Hastings. Edinburgh 1908 ff.
7. Dictionary of the Bible, ed. by J. Hastings. Edinburgh 1898-1904.
8. Dictionnaire de Theologie Catholique ed. by A. Vacant and E. Mangenot.
Paris 1903.
9. Theolog. Wörterbuch. Zum New Testament ed. by G. Kittel. Stuttgart 1933.